Vol. XXXV. APRIL, 1958. No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. Cunningham, V.G., Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 93

Decree of S. C. of Rites on wax candles—Celebration of Mass by sick priest—Facultas Theologica Sydneyensis—Rescript of S. C. of Propaganda about Fast and Abstinence concessions—Papal Allocution to ecclesiastical archivists.

CAN MIXED MARRIAGES BE REDUCED IN AUSTRALIA? ..... Rev. Cyril McMaster, C.SS.R. 103

THE THEOLOGY OF MYSTERIES, II,
Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 118

CHARITY AND ETHICS ..... Rev. Robert W. Gleeson, S.J. 126

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 136

Problems concerning Mass stipends—The use of narcotics—Bination on week-days.

CANON LAW ..... Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, P.C., D.C.L. 147

Marriage case concerning sanatio in radice.

LITURGY ..... Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 151

Questions on consecration of a church—Number of candles at Low Mass—The Rite of Marriage—The singing of the Benedictus.

HOMILETICS ..... Rev. Bede Heather, S.T.L., L.S.S. 159

Christ, Our Teacher.

NOTES 166

Problems About Problems (Rev. John Burnheim, M.A., Ph.D.)—The Beginnings of Diplomacy (Very Rev. T. Veech).

BOOK REVIEWS 176

Mary's Spiritual Maternity, according to modern writers (Kenney); The Development of the Theological Censures after the Council of Trent (Cahill); The Student's Companion to Gibbon (Collins); The Dynamics of World History (Dawson); Crucial Problems of Modern Philosophy (Hawkins) [p. 164].

SHORT NOTICES 117, 146, 165

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Aprilis, 1958.

Official Documents

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

I

On the percentage of wax or oil in candles for liturgical use.

Many local Ordinaries have asked this Sacred Congregation whether Decree n.4147, of December 14, 1914, still remains in force. That Decree prescribes that "the paschal candle, which is immersed in the baptismal water, and the two candles lit at Mass must be of beeswax, at least mainly and chiefly—that is, in greatest part; the composition of other candles placed on the altar must have a major or notable quantity of the same beeswax."

The Sacred Congregation of Rites, after consulting a special Commission answered: *Yes and ad mentem.*

The mind of the Sacred Congregation is that the paschal candle, the two candles destined for the Sacrifice of the Mass, and also that candle which in some places is used for a lamp and specially made to burn unceasingly before the Blessed Sacrament reserved in the tabernacle—its mind is that these should contain a suitable amount of beeswax or of olive or other vegetable oil, so that in the more important liturgical actions, and for honouring the Blessed Sacrament reserved for worship, the more noble material may, as far as possible, be used.

Considering present circumstances, however, since these do not everywhere permit the manufacture of candles having the prescribed maximum part of the aforesaid material, and while these circumstances continue, it is committed to the Episcopal Conferences of each nation to determine precisely what percentage of wax or oil of olives or other plants should be laid down as a minimum for candles which are to be used liturgically. Where Conferences of Bishops do not meet, the local Ordinaries may decide. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

December 13, 1957.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, Prefect.

✠ A. CARINCI, Abp. Seleuc, Secretary.

II

INSTRUCTION

On the celebration of Mass by concession of Apostolic Indult granted to a priest who is sick or whose sight has failed.

PRAENOTANDA

1. A sick priest or one whose sight is so weakened accidentally or habitually that he can read only very large print, may obtain a dispensation from the Sacred Congregation of Rites to celebrate, according to the rules accurately given hereunder, a votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary or the daily Mass of the Dead.

2. The conditions of this privilege must be observed exactly.

3. If, while enjoying the privilege, the priest goes totally blind, he must abstain from celebrating Mass, till he has obtained a new Indult from the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments; and having obtained it, he is obliged *sub gravi* to use the assistance of another priest.

2. RULES OF THE VOTIVE MASS OF THE B.V.M.

I. Which Votive Mass of B.V.M. is to be said.

1. Such a sick priest or one going blind, if duly dispensed, will say the *fifth* votive Mass of the B.V. at all times of the year, always in white vestments.

2. If, however, his sight is still sufficient to read the other four votive Masses of the B.V. according to the seasons, he may celebrate these.

II. When the Votive of B.V. must be said.

1. The votive Mass of the B.V.M. *can* be said at any time of the year; it *must* be said on all and each of those days on which the Calendar of the Church where the priest celebrates does not permit a daily Mass of the Dead—excepting further

privileges regarding the Masses of the Dead to be mentioned hereafter.

2. During the Sacred Triduum of Holy Week the priest going blind shall abstain altogether from celebrating.

3. On the Feast of the Nativity of Our Lord, he may say three Masses.

III. In what rite is it to be celebrated.

I. If the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin is celebrated *pro re gravi* and a public cause, the priest of weak sight shall say: One Oration, *Gloria, Credo,* Preface in solemn tone, *Ite Missa est,* and the last Gospel of St. John *In principio,* although other non-privileged priests may be obliged that day to make some commemoration or say a Collect ordered by the Ordinary.

2. In all other cases:

(a) *Gloria in excelsis* is said:

i. Whenever it is said in the Mass of the current day, according to the Calendar of the particular church;

ii. On the jubilee of the priest's ordination;

iii. On Saturday.

(b) As regards prayers: only one prayer is said.

(c) The *Credo* is said:

i. Whenever it is said in the Mass of the current day according to the Calendar of the particular church;

ii. On the jubilee of the priest's ordination.

(d) In the Preface the words: *et te in veneratione* are used except on Feasts of the B.V.M., in which the Festive Preface is used.

(e) The last Gospel is always of St. John: *In principio.*

(f) In private Oratories the priest uses his own Calendar.

3. Rubrics for the Mass of the Dead.

1. On days permitted by Rubric according to the Calendar of the particular church, or according to his own in private

Oratories a priest, as above, can celebrate a daily Mass of the Dead, with or without chant.

2. This Mass he celebrates also on the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed, in which he shall say only one prayer: *Fidelium;* observing (if he celebrates two or three Masses) the Constitution of Pope Benedict XV *Incruentum Altaris sacrificium,* in virtue of which he may apply one Mass only to any intention of his choice and receive a stipend for it; the other Mass, without stipend, he must apply for all the faithful departed and for the Supreme Pontiff's intention, like other priests.

3. One prayer is said in this Mass.

4. To the sequence *Dies irae* such a priest is never bound. But, if he sings Mass, although he does not read the Sequence, the choir must not omit to sing it.

ROMANA

This Instruction, approved by Pope Benedict XV, and now revised, the undersigned Cardinal ordered to be published. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

December 15, 1957.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, Prefect.

✠ A. CARINCI, Abp. Seleuc, Secretary.

FACULTAS THEOLOGICA SYDNEYENSIS

Letter from S. C. of Seminaries and Universities.

S. C. de Seminariis
et Studiorum Universitatibus.

Romae d.d. xx m.ian. A.D. MCMLVIII.

Em.me et Rev.me Domine mi Observandissime,

Grato animo accepimus quae de Facultate Theologica Sydneyensi post expletum quadriennium a canonica eiusdem erectione ad hanc Sacram Congregationem diligenter significasti litteris d.d. XXVIII m. decembris sup. a.

Perlibenter legimus quae de incrementis dilectae istius Facultatis fusius nuntias, de auctis aedibus, bibliothecae in primis aularumque, de scientifica navitate qua plures Facultatis Professores innotuerunt, de sedecim Magistris qui assiduam operam impendunt alumnos tum theologicis disciplinis tum philosophica propaedeutica imbuendo, de auditoribus tandem scholisque instituendis.

Vehementer Eminentiae Tuae Rev.mae gratulamur omnibusque in tanto opere tecum cooperantibus quod nulli parcatis labori quo altior uberiorque in dies fiat doctrinarum enucleatio atque profectus, adeo ut, religiose in primis servata sana verborum forma tuteque custodito Magisterii "deposito" illi plane adhaereatis fini, qui a Constitutione Apostolica "Deus scientiarum Dominus" praescriptus est Facultatibus studiorum ecclesiasticorum (art 2): "Auditores ad fontium cognitionem, ad investigationis laborisque scientifici usum atque ad magisterium exercendum instruere; denique iisdem disciplinis excolendis provehendisque quam maxime consulere."

Cum igitur omnia recte progressa sint in Theologica Facultate Sydneyensi instruenda, ad doctrinam excolendam fulciendamque in primis quod attinet, sacra haec Congregatio pro munere eidem Facultati tribuit ut pleno iure utatur annum quintum cursus theologici stricte dicti (septimum integrae Facultatis) constituendi ordinandique, quo completo auditores qui omnibus generalibus ac peculiaribus praescriptis satisfecerint laurea doctorali decorari valeant.

Velit Eminentia Tua Rev.ma id summopere tum magistris tum alumnis laudatae Facultatis commendare ut acri assiduaque industria doctrinarum studia scientifica methodo provehantur, in veritatis proventum Sanctaeque Ecclesiae decus, omnium vanorum titulorum cupiditate iactantiaque plane posthabita. Vota ergo plurima facimus ut Theologica Facultas Sydneyensis et plures paulatim auditores tum ex omnibus Oceaniae Dioecesibus tum ex religiosis familiis arcessat et eruditas monographias eximiorum professorum edat, quarum claritate fideles infedelesque mentes moveantur atque alliceantur.

Prospera interea cuncta Tibi, Em.me Domine, ex animo adprecati, moderatoribus ac magistris, qui tantopere tecum de sacra doctrina undequaque augenda solliciti sunt, Divini Spiritus lumina flagitamus, qua plenius in dies Theologica Facultas Sydneyensis vivat, crescat, floreat.

Manus Eminentiae Tuae humillime osculatus, maxima qua par est veneratione, maneo

Em.tiae Tuae Rev.mae
addictissimus servus verus,

Em.mo et Rev.mo Dno.
N. T. CARD. GILROY,
Archiepiscopo Sydneyensi.

J. CARD. PIZZARDO
✠ C. CONFALONIERI, a Secr.

RESCRIPT OF S. C. DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

Prorogation of Fast and Abstinence Concessions
(Prot. N. 5192/57)

Beatissime Pater,

Delegatus Apostolicus Australiae, Novae Zelandiae et Oceaniae, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, nomine Ordinariorum Australiae et Novae Zelandiae, humiliter petit prorogationem concessionis iisdem Ordinariis factae per Rescriptum diei 18 novembris 1947 (Prot. N. 4410/47) super legem ieiunii et abstinentiae, videlicet:

1. (a) ut dies abstinentiae tantum sint omnes et solae Feriae VIae per annum sive intra sive extra Quadragesimam.

(b) dies abstinentiae simul et ieiunii sint Feria IV Cinerum et Feriae VIae in Quadragesima et Quattuor Temporum.

(c) dies ieiunii tantum sint, ceterae Feriae et Sabbata in Quadragesima et Feriae IVae et Sabbata Quattuor Temporum.

2. ut insuper, praeter concessiones iam a can. 1251/2 C.I.C. admissas, diebus ieiunii tantum in duabus refectionibus, matutina scilicet et serotina, ad solam quantitatem, non autem ad qualitatem ciborum lex restringatur.

Et Deus. . . .

Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, vigore facultatum

sibi a Sanctissimo D. N. Pio Div. Prov. Papa XII tributarum, petitam prorogationem concedit in forma et terminis praecedentis Rescripti, ad aliud decennium.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 17 mensis decembris a.d. 1957.

pro Ex.mo Domino Secretario

C. CORVO (subscr.)

PAPAL ALLOCUTION

To the ecclesiastical Archivists of Italy holding their first Convention at Rome.

(*November* 5, 1957)

His Holiness, who, during the years of the second world war, showed how much he was interested in preserving the treasures of the Archives of Italy, greeted the congressists with paternal affability and, in his discourse, drew their attention to some most interesting facts in the history of Italy's ecclesiastical Archives, particularly those of the Vatican.

The Convention, the Pope said, was originally convened under the high patronage of His Eminence Cardinal Giovanni Mercati, Librarian and Archivist of the Holy Roman Church and Protector of the Vatican Library and Archives. But before the Convention met, it pleased divine Providence to call to the reward of the just the chosen soul of that humble and laborious veteran, who had given his whole life to learned studies. His brother, Monsignor Angelo Mercati, for 30 years Prefect of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, had died more than a year earlier. He had done giant work as Archivist during those 30 years.

It was in 1936 that Cardinal Giovanni Mercati was called to the double office of Librarian and Archivist in the Apostolic Palace. He was really born for such charges. He was a scientific worker in the highest sense of the term, a man with a flair for erudite studies, an enthusiastic research worker endowed with that intuition which leads to discovery, a scholar with a severe critical sense, with the patience required for scholarly verification, an expert systematizer and co-ordinator of documents

He had the scrupulous conscience of the true investigator. This kept him constantly attached to the search for historical accuracy and kept him immune from the errors that come from hurried work. An eloquent witness of his possession of these gifts may be pointed out in the famous palimpsest of the "Hexapla," discovered by him in the Ambrosian Library in 1893, and which after 60 years, three days before his death, was on his table undergoing the weighing process of a criticism which was never satisfied. Such long study of one document might lead one to believe that he published very little, but he had to his credit no less than 420 monographs and articles on the most varied subjects. The Cardinal was really a worthy successor of those distinguished luminaries who had preceded him in such work, and with whom he had collaborated: Cardinal Franz Ehrle, Achille Ratti, Our glorious Predecessor, Blessed Contardo Ferrini and others.

On the practical side, Cardinal Mercati attended to the development of the Courses of Palaeography and Diplomatica as also to those of Archivistics and Bibliotheconomy at the Vatican. He conducted a census of the ecclesiastical Archives of Italy desired by His Holiness in 1942, the card-index of which is deposited in the Vatican Archives.

The magnificent labours of Giovanni and Angelo Mercati are, however, only recent links in the golden chain of the archivistic tradition of the Holy See.

From the Cinquencento St. Pius V and St. Charles Borromeo stand out. Following the brief indications given by the Council of Trent, the Saint of Milan had minute registers made regarding all ecclesiastical institutions in his Province. Convents of nuns were included, and special note is taken of the obligation imposed on a Superioress, that she must remind parents of postulants about the excommunication sanctioned by the Council of Trent against those who compelled girls to embrace the religious life against their will.

The Pope pointed out that Manzoni's famous novel *I Promessi Sposi* shows some of the sad results of such doings in the civilization of the Seicento.

His Holiness referred to the merits of Sixtus V, Clement VIII, and Paul V in regard to the organization of ecclesiastical Archives throughout Italy. It was Clement that originated the

idea of Secret Pontifical Archives in Rome and Paul V established them, not in their first locale, the Castle of Sant' Angelo, but beside the Vatican Library.

The brief Pontificate of Benedict XIII (1724-1730) was particularly important, for this Pontiff published a Constitution, *Maxima Vigilantia* (June 14, 1727), prescribing the regulations governing the ecclesiastical Archives of Rome and the dioceses of Italy.

This document, as historians acknowledge, had excellent effects on the keeping of ecclesiastical Archives. In recent times the Italian State has had reason to be grateful for the indications obtained from parochial books and even from those on the *status animarum*, for they have proved very useful towards the advancement of modern demographic studies.

In 1881, Pope Leo XIII opened the Secret Vatican Archives to the research of students of history. This was a courageous act inspired by the consciousness that the Church had nothing to fear from the serious and dispassionate study of its documents. On the contrary, such study was to prove a splendid piece of defence for the Church and the Papacy. Publications of documents and research based on the Secret Archives have proved agreeably surprising and have impressed non-Catholics not a little. Actually the evidence from the Secret Archives re-echoes the divine promise: *Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi* (Matt. 28:20).

Naturally, the Popes have sovereign rights over their own Archives. The Secret Archives of the Vatican are not primarily historical repositories. They are primarily and principally for the service of the Roman Pontiff and the Curia, to help the Holy See in the administration of the universal Church. The Holy See has no obligation to give a public account of the administration of its Archives.

The great act of Leo XIII had another effect, namely, that of bringing into one central collection the various archivistic funds of the Lateran, of the Roman Congregations, of the Pontifical Offices and Tribunals, as well as those of families such as Borghese, Rospigliosi, Boncompagni, which have been acquired from time to time by the Holy See.

In this way—the simple parallel is in place—just as streams

bursting out from the mountain sides, if they follow their own course, as it were, in ignorance of each other, can lose themselves uselessly in the wilderness, but, on the contrary, if gathered and guided to a centre of utility, will bring fecundity and refreshment to wide areas, so the treasures of many archives have become a reservoir of universal erudition in the Secret Archives of the Vatican. These are the great central support of all ecclesiastical Archives and are also their model, since no pains are being spared by the Holy See to preserve and arrange their treasures and make the use of them as convenient as possible.

The instructions which have emanated from the Holy See for the increase and good state of other ecclesiastical Archives, especially the Circular Letter of the Cardinal Secretary of State, given on the 15th of April, 1923, have the same purpose. In their spirit, publication of documents, when opportune and possible, will be a public benefit. It is particularly desirable to have those documents published which have true historical interest and usefulness, especially in regard to pastoral Theology and the care of souls.

The noble impulse of scholarly erudition will be enhanced by zeal for the glory of God and the honour of the Spouse of Christ. Much that is true and beautiful and pious still remains hidden in those yellowed pages, and if brought to light, will bear new testimony to the Church's splendid role in the history of the world.

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Can Mixed Marriages Be Reduced In Australia?

During more than 25 years' missionary work in Australia and New Zealand, I have noticed that most of the careless I have "visited" were either partners of a mixed marriage or children of one, or both. In one large parish, 61 of the 70 careless families I "visited" were connected with a mixed marriage. Many priests have told me they believe the Church is losing more Catholics through mixed marriages than all other causes combined and that the loss is great.

I. LOSSES TO THE CHURCH THROUGH MIXED MARRIAGES ARE WORLDWIDE.

Father Ter Haar, C.SS.R., in his book "Mixed Marriages and Their Remedies" (English translation by Rev. A. Walter, C.SS.R., published in 1933) gives statistics of mixed marriages in Germany, which he took from the figures given by Father H. Krose, S.J., who pointed out that they and their disastrous results were increasing. I quote Father Krose's figures (page 22).

In 1912 there were 154,871 Catholic marriages and 53,804 mixed.

In 1927 there were 139,599 Catholic marriages and 64,096 mixed.

Between 1910 and 1923—79,733 Protestants were converted to Catholicism; 114,216 Catholics embraced Protestantism. Father Krose believes that most of the defections to Protestantism were the direct result of mixed marriages. His opinion is supported by the Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops, issued in 1922, which stated that more souls are lost to the Church through mixed marriages than are gained by all the labours of foreign missionaries throughout the entire pagan world. In this same Letter, the Bishops stated, "Accurate observation teaches that the offspring of mixed marriages is, for the most part, Protestant in the third generation." Father Krose also stated that only about 40% of the children born of mixed marriages in Germany were baptized in the Catholic Church. Losses to the Church, therefore, were more than 50%.

In 1920 Archbishop Whiteside of Liverpool asserted that in his Archdiocese 2148 Catholics married to non-Catholics have become practical apostates (that is, he says, whilst they have not joined any other sect they have given up the practice of their faith and are bringing up their children as non-Catholics), whilst only 1444 Protestants after marriage with Catholics have embraced the faith. (v. Ter Haar's "Mixed Marriages and Their Remedies," English translation, p. 21). In this Archdiocese, the loss to the Church was far greater than 50%.

We read in the "Volkskirche," the review of the Evangelical Society (of 1921), "In Prussia, the Catholics, who are 38%, had in the year 1916 43.51% of the children born; the Protestants, who are 60%, had only 48.51%. Yet that difference is compensated for by mixed marriages, which are beneficial to Protestantism in their offspring."

In the U.S.A., those who have studied the matter say that less than half the children born of mixed marriages are brought up Catholics. cf. "Mixed Marriages," by Father F. J. Connell, C.SS.R., American Ecclesiastical Review, July, 1931.

Strange as it may seem, whilst writing this article, a friend gave me a copy of the Australian Woman's Weekly (July 31, 1957), asking me to read one of its subjects, entitled "Interfaith marriages . . . a growing headache," by J. H. Pollack, which is based on a book called "One Marriage, Two Faiths," by Drs. Bossard and Boll, of Pennsylvania University, U.S.A. I quote from Mr. Pollack:

"Their study shows that many mixed marriages involve Roman Catholics. The Rev. Father John L. Thomas, of St. Louis University, reports that three out of ten marriages performed by the Roman Catholic Church are interfaith ones. Other Catholic studies reveal that another 15 to 25% of marriages involving Catholics are without official Catholic permission. Together, these two figures mean that at least one half of all Catholics marry non-Catholics."

Taking into account the usual large losses to the faith through mixed marriages and adding the 15 to 25% of "extra ecclesiam" marriages mentioned by Mr. Pollack, it would seem that the Church in U.S.A. is losing more souls now than in 1931, proportionally and numerically. It could easily mean that 60

out of every 100 who are baptized or should have been baptized in the Church are Protestants—or no religion—or, at least, non-practising Catholics.

II. IN AUSTRALIA, THE LOSS TO THE CHURCH IS ALREADY ALARMING.

Are the results of mixed marriages in Australia any better than in U.S.A.? Expressing merely a personal opinion based on missionary experience in 18 dioceses, I doubt whether 50% of the children born of mixed marriages practise the faith after the age of 17 or 18. Many, maybe most of them, have attended a Catholic school for a longer or shorter period of time; but the lack of complete Catholic influence in the home and carelessness about the duties of the faith so commonly engendered by these unions outweighed the influence and teaching of brothers and nuns.

In almost every parish where there is at least one Catholic school, we find some Catholic children in the State controlled school, at times in large numbers. Scarcely any of these children attend Mass; few, if any, become good Catholics. In one very large city, where there are dozens of excellent Catholic schools, there are between fifteen and twenty thousand Catholic children in State controlled schools. It is a safe conjecture to say that more than 90% of them come from mixed marriage homes. Would I be exaggerating if I were to suggest that hardly any of them will ever become practical Catholics? Though all of them, being baptized in the Catholic Church, are bound by the Form of Marriage, how many will marry according to that Form? How many—or should I say, how few—of their children will become practical Catholics? Would it be rash to claim that nearly all these children will be Protestants or of no religion in one generation?

A factor nearly always overlooked when computing losses sustained through mixed marriages is the omission of their Protestant descendants, for these losses are truly sustained through mixed marriages. Catholic descendants of mixed marriages frequently marry Protestants *extra ecclesiam,* and their children are brought up Protestants from birth, or, at least, are not Catholics. Naturally, these non-Catholic children are not included in the census books as Catholics. Yet, if the original

Catholic partner had obeyed the Church's prohibition against mixed marriages, these children would have been Catholics in a completely Catholic home. As these Protestant descendants will marry Protestants as a general rule, the number lost to the Church will increase year by year. I know 43 Protestants descended from one mixed marriage in two generations. How many will their descendants be in 100 years' time? Whatever the number, and it will be immense, it constitutes the number lost to the Church through *one mixed marriage.*

III. HAS THE PREVALENCE OF MIXED MARRIAGES LESSENED OUR FEAR OF THEM?

These unions are so commonplace nowadays that there is a real danger that some priests will become so accustomed to them as to be apathetic in their resistance to them, and it is only a short step from lack of zeal in upholding the Church's law against mixed marriages to a tacit agreement with them. Years ago, a priest told me he was not opposed to mixed marriages, giving as his reason that his father was a non-Catholic and a very good man, while all his family were good Catholics. He added that he was not alone among priests in this matter.

We priests have grown up side by side with mixed marriages. They are common in every Australian State, more numerous than fully Catholic marriages in some parishes, and are increasing at least numerically, if not proportionately, with the increased growth in population. It is easy to grow accustomed to them, or to be discouraged by the task of lessening them, and, more or less, to make peace with them. But if through discouragement or apathy or any other cause, we give up the struggle against them, they and their evils will continue to increase, not decrease. Can priests, with a safe conscience, be indifferent to this great danger to the welfare of the Church and souls? Canon 1064 decrees:

Ordinarii alique animarum pastores:

1° *Fideles a mixtis nuptiis, quantum possunt, absterreant;*

2° *Si eas impedire non valeant, omni studio curent ne contra Dei et Ecclesiae leges contrahantur.*

That *quantum possunt, absterreant* is more than advisory; it is a command given by the Church to all who have pastoral

care of souls. It states that pastors must actively strive to prevent mixed marriages, thereby putting into practice the prohibition of Can. 1060 against such unions. Only when their efforts to prevent a mixed marriage have failed ought they make use of the dispensation mentioned in Can. 1061, and then, of course, only when the conditions laid down by the same canon are morally certain of fulfilment.

It is very easy to allow the fear of a marriage *extra ecclesiam* to stultify our resistance to these unions and say he—generally she—is good enough to make a success of it and get the dispensation. The fact that the Catholic is good surely supplies the greater reason for preventing the marriage. Those who are good Catholics are more likely to listen to the Church than those who are not, and also to do more good for souls if married to a Catholic.

IV. THE CHURCH'S MIND AND LAWS REGARDING MIXED MARRIAGES.

Canon 1060 states: *severissime Ecclesia ubique prohibet ne matrimonium ineatur inter duas personas baptizatas, quarum altera sit catholica, altera vero sectae haereticae seu schismaticae adscripta; quod si adsit perversionis periculum coniugis catholici et prolis, coniugium ipsa etiam lege divina vetatur.* The Church's mind is clearly stated; she does not desire any mixed marriages anywhere.

Canon 1061 confirms 1060; because, although it permits a dispensation from the law which prohibits mixed marriages *severissime* it does so under such strict conditions that it shows the Church's reluctance to do so. To say blandly and without qualification, as nearly all the laity do, that the Church permits mixed marriages, and that is all there is to be said on the matter, is not stating the mind of the Church or even the letter of her law correctly. It gives the impression that dispensations can be obtained merely by asking for them and that the Church is quite satisfied that Catholics marry non-Catholics *provided* they ask for and get a dispensation. Canon 1061 contradicts that idea flatly:

A. *Ecclesia super impedimento mixtae religionis non dispensat, nisi*

(1) *Urgent justae ac gravae causae;*

(2) *Cautionem praestiterit conjux acatholicus de amovendo a conjuge catholico perversionis periculo, et uterque conjux de universo prole catholice tantum baptizanda et educanda;*

(3) *Moralis habeatur certitudo de cautionum implemento;*

B. *Cautiones regulariter in scriptis exigantur.*

Father Damen, C.SS.R., formerly Professor of Moral Theology in Propaganda College, Rome, following St. Alphonsus' and St. Thomas's teaching on certitude says that *strict* moral certainty rests on so great probability that it excludes all prudent *fear* of error, and that *broad* moral certainty excludes all prudent *doubt* of error; but not all prudent fear of error. This last certainty is had in an opinion that is *probabilissima et unice probabilis* and also one that is certainly or notably more probable than its opposite (cf. Damen, Vol. 1, n. 77). But is it always safe to say that this moral certainty, either strict or broad, is present when—

(a) the non-Catholic party sits silent and sullen during the instructions before marriage, merely enduring them as a necessary means of acquiring a certain Catholic girl as his wife; or

(b) when the Catholic party's faith is weak; or

(c) when the Catholic party is prepared to marry *extra ecclesiam* unless the dispensation is granted?

According to Father Ter Haar, the moral certainty required is something quite different from mere *certainty* that the parties really *intend* to carry out their promises. A written promise is not sufficient in itself. A judgment would have to be made from other circumstances that they were of a type who would faithfully carry out the promises. There would have to be moral certainty that the *non-Catholic* would give all the children an adequate Catholic training if the Catholic partner should die before the children had finished their Catholic education. Circumstances such as the following would have to be considered Is the Catholic the child of a mixed marriage in which the "cautions" were not kept? Is the non-Catholic bitter towards the Church, and of dominant personality? Is the mixed marriage couple going to live in the bush or where there is no Catholic church or school, or in the home of non-Catholic relatives for

some considerable time? Is the Catholic a person of weak faith or weak character? Other equally important factors must be considered. Father Ter Haar claims that unless *moral certainty* that the promises will be fulfilled can be obtained, an ecclesiastical superior cannot give the dispensation. No one envies those who have to decide on this moral certainty required by the Church. In many cases, such decisions must cause great anxiety. However, the large number of failures seems to indicate that moral certainty was not obtained in many cases; for moral certainty is incompatible with so many heart-breaking results.

Father Ter Haar also says that the *cautio* given by both is a promise to give all the children an adequate Catholic training, and not merely a *cursory* instruction in the rudiments of the faith.

V. AN INTERESTING CASE CONCERNING MIXED MARRIAGES.

Some time ago, I gave a mission in a large country town which I shall call Carthago. For 27 years, no mixed marriages have been celebrated in that parish. The results are so remarkable that they are worthy of mention.

(1) No mixed marriages have taken place in the parish for 27 years.

(2) During the last 10 years, only seven parishioners have entered a mixed marriage (outside the parish).

(3) The people's minds have been adjusted to the Church's teaching on mixed marriages.

(4) Carthago's policy has changed the drift away from the Church through mixed marriages to a drift into the Church through increased conversions.

(5) There are only 18 children who received Catholic baptism in the State controlled primary schools which have more than 1180 on their rolls.

(6) There are fewer careless than is usual in parishes of this size.

(7) The percentage of careless is decreasing; the percentage of practical Catholics is increasing.

(8) It is doubtful whether any Catholics marry *extra*

ecclesiam because mixed marriages are not celebrated within the parish.

The following notes are enlargements upon the above-mentioned points.

(1) Mixed marriages have ceased in this parish for 27 years. This is especially noteworthy, because it has happened in a predominantly non-Catholic community. Moreover, this practice has increased both the *quantity* and the *quality* of the faith. One would have to live in Carthago for a time to realize what has been achieved there; because it is so different from what is happening elsewhere. There are about 740 women in the Sacred Heart Sodality and 150 girls in the Children of Mary Confraternity and 90% of these receive their monthly Communion on the appointed Sunday. About 80% of the 700 men and boys of the Holy Name Society receive Communion regularly on the second Sunday. More than 100,000 Communions are received each year. Last year there were 60 Catholic marriages; no Catholic entered a mixed marriage even outside the parish, nor was there an *extra ecclesiam* union.

For 27 years Carthago has had a yearly mission. I was one of the two priests who conducted the last one. An average of 750-800 women attended each night of Women's Week and an average of 600-650 men during Men's Week. Including the children, there were more than 3000 confessions in a total of little more than 4000 Catholics. Incidentally, this is the complete answer to those who oppose yearly missions. All this occurs in a town which is still predominantly non-Catholic, for Catholics number only about one-third of its population.

(2) During the last 10 years only seven parishioners have entered mixed marriages—outside the parish. That makes an average of one every 17 months. Some of these have already ceased to practise the faith.

(3) Why do so few of Carthago's parishioners ask for a dispensation to marry a non-Catholic? It is because the laity there have at last grasped the mind of the Church regarding mixed marriages and the severity of the Church's prohibition against them. They *really believe* the Church prohibits them more strictly than meat on Friday. They are convinced that Catholics should marry Catholics because they receive at least four instructions every year on the Church's teaching and are

given many reasons why these marriages should be avoided. They do not get the same instruction each time; they get the case presented in every possible way. The parish priest told me it is the duty of the parish priest to form the mind of his parishioners, and he has certainly done so in this important matter. The people are now convinced that the Church prohibits these marriages *severissime.*

(4) All priests admit that there is a large drift away from the Church through mixed marriages; but in Carthago that drift has been stopped, and even changed into a drift into the Church through conversions. During the last 10 years, 198 converts have entered the Church. Having been told that Catholics must marry Catholics, and being impressed by the fact that the Catholic parties were prepared to obey the Church in spite of their love, these non-Catholics decided to examine the claims of such a Church. They ended by entering its fold. Not only the parish priest, but his assistant priests say these converts are among the best Catholics in the parish.

(5) In the State controlled primary schools there are 18 children who have received Catholic Baptism. Of these, 14 are being brought up as non-Catholics; 10 of these 14 come from *four mixed marriage* homes in which the Protestant partner has assumed complete control; four are from two lapsed Catholic homes; the parents of the remaining four children are "supposed to be Catholics."

N.B.—No Catholic child resident in Carthago attends any of Carthago's State controlled secondary schools.

(6) Are there any careless in Carthago? There are; but they are less than in any other parish of the same size I have visited. During the mission, a nun made a significant remark when I visited one of the schools during the women's week of the mission. She said, "Some of the children told me their mothers are not going to the mission." And she added, "They are children of mixed marriages and they are newcomers to Carthago." A housing settlement has been built since the war, and it is there, among people who have not been brought up in Carthago, that the greatest carelessness and percentage of mixed marriages are found.

(7) A logical consequence of the "no mixed marriage" policy

is that the percentage of careless is decreasing and the percentage of practical Catholics increasing, because the Catholic children born in the last 25 years are almost all born of fully Catholic marriages.

(8) Very few, if any, marry *extra ecclesiam* because Carthago does not celebrate mixed marriages within the parish. Many priests fear that if dispensations are not granted to those who seek them, all or most will marry *extra ecclesiam*. The results in Carthago indicate that such fear is very often groundless. During the last 10 years, 22 Catholics have married *extra ecclesiam*. It would be very rash to claim that all, or even any of these Catholics married *extra ecclesiam* because of Carthago's policy, or that they would have made a success of their marriages from the Church's viewpoint had they been granted a dispensation for a mixed marriage, as only three of them asked for it. Of these three, one was a widower who gave his children to the non-Catholic mother of his deceased wife, after agreeing that they could be brought up as Protestants. In the second case, the *non-Catholic* party was the son of a mixed marriage, who refused to see a priest or receive instructions. In the third case, after some inquiry, it was found that the non-Catholic's husband was still living. In four other cases, the Catholic parties wished to marry—and later did marry—divorcees. In the other cases the Protestant was the dominating person and the Catholics yielded for the sake of material gain. So Carthago's policy on mixed marriages was not responsible for any of these losses.

VI. WOULD A MORE INTENSIVE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THEM REDUCE THEIR NUMBER?

Is it possible to reduce mixed marriages in Australia? I believe a more intensive campaign against them would more than repay the effort involved. If we could make the *laity think* as the *Church thinks* on this matter, mixed marriages would decrease greatly.

Could we help the laity to understand the mind of the Church better?

(1) By more explicit and more frequent instructions to the older children in primary schools and to all the children in secondary schools on the strictness of the Church's prohibition against mixed marriages, telling them not to keep company

with non-Catholics; telling them also of the tremendous losses to the faith through these unions. Children are generous; appeal to their loyalty to the Church.

(2) By instructing the faithful *several* times every year on the reasons why the Church prohibits mixed marriages, viz., the danger of injury to the faith of the Catholic party and of the children; also the loss of the Church in both quantity and quality of faith, and the absence of mutual help between husband and wife. *In particular,* make them understand the gravity of the Church's prohibition—*severissime*—i.e., under pain of mortal sin. Almost all the laity are ignorant of the gravity of the prohibition. They simply do not *realize* that they are under a stricter obligation to avoid mixed marriages than meat on Friday. *This, I believe, is the root cause of the prevalence of mixed marriages in Australia.* We have many good, sincere Catholics in this country, yet we see many of these, who would not culpably miss Mass on Sunday or eat meat on Friday, entering mixed marriages without any scruple of conscience. It seems obvious that they do not understand the true meaning of Canon 1060; otherwise, as good Catholics, they would not seek a non-Catholic partner in marriage. Until the laity understand the Canons concerning mixed marriages as clearly as they understand the prohibition against meat on Friday, there is little hope that mixed marriages will decrease. Experience seems to indicate that this conformity of the mind of the laity to the mind of the Church as expressed by Canon 1060 is not successfully achieved by a *yearly* reference to the matter. They forget it long before 12 months have passed. But if, year after year, the people were instructed *several times* on this vitally important matter, I feel sure that a far greater number of Catholics would be convinced that they should seek Catholic partners in marriage, and would actually do so.

Naturally, the prevalence of mixed marriages is a stumbling block to a proper understanding of Canon 1060. The laity cannot see canonical distinctions as a priest can, and they say when they wish to marry a non-Catholic, "Others can get dispensations, so also can I." It is indeed "a sticky wicket."

(3) By explaining that asking for a dispensation is, in many cases, disloyalty to the Church and in some cases contempt to her law and sinful.

(4) By pointing out the lack of union, dangers of quarrels about religion, lack of example to children. Support by examples.

(5) By explaining the grave dangers that must arise from non-Catholics' outlook on birth control.

(6) By showing the difficulty the Catholic party encounters in attending single-handed to the faith of the children. Explain that this is why so many give up the struggle.

(7) By informing the people that, when a non-Catholic seeks a Catholic's company, the Catholic is obliged in conscience to inform the non-Catholic of the Church's prohibition against mixed marriages. That the Catholic, moreover, would be guilty of grave sin if he or she continued that company-keeping, unless he or she had good reason to believe there was then, or would be before marriage, a justifying cause for entering such a union.

(8) By advising young Catholics to pray for and look for a Catholic partner.

(9) By showing how a mixed marriage home is divided through life on religion, the most important point in life.

(10) By telling the people plainly of the Church's losses through mixed marriages and that that is the reason for the Church's prohibition. By telling them that the preservation and spread of the faith depends largely on their obedience to the Church's laws on marriage.

(11) By making dispensations difficult to obtain in very large centres where there are thousands of eligible Catholic partners.

(12) If a priest knows that a Catholic is keeping company with a non-Catholic, he could interview that Catholic and explain the Church's law in its true strictness to him or to her and try to persuade that Catholic to abandon the company of the non-Catholic. He could also interview the non-Catholic and explain the Church's law to him or her, explain why it was made, and even suggest that he or she undertake a course of instructions on the One True Church in order that he or she may understand why we claim there is only One True Church and that it is the Catholic Church. Father Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., who wrote the article, "Mixed Marriages," in the American Ecclesiastical Review of July, 1931, said that in those parts of the U.S.A. where priests and bishops insisted on the non-Catholic taking a

course of instructions in the Catholic faith, more than 70% of those thus instructed entered the Church.

(13) By doing more in the confessional when we meet a Catholic who is keeping company with a non-Catholic without any canonical reason for seeking a dispensation. Are we free to keep silent on this matter in that holy place? Ter Haar says the confessor is *per se* bound *sub gravi* to admonish such a penitent and, at times, to refuse absolution.

VII. DIVERGENT VIEWS ON LONG-RANGE RESULTS OF A MILDER OR STRICTER POLICY IN GRANTING DISPENSATIONS, ESPECIALLY WHEN THERE IS DANGER OF A MARRIAGE "EXTRA ECCLESIAM"

Over the years there have been divergent views regarding the strictness to be employed, in practice, in granting dispensations for mixed marriages, especially those given to prevent a marriage *extra ecclesiam.*

Those who adopt the more lenient view and take cognizance of the immediate danger confronting them, viz., marriage *extra ecclesiam,* say that the dispensation prevents the scandal of such a marriage and its consequent concubinage, prevents many Catholics and their offspring from falling away from the Church, brings a possibility of the conversion of the non-Catholic, and gains a promise that the children will be brought up as Catholics. If dispensations are refused, they claim that the number of Catholics will decrease as time goes on.

Those who hold the stricter, and what they call the long-range view say the more lenient view leads to a greater loss in both quantity and quality of faith than the stricter practice does in the course of time. They say the danger of perversion of the Catholic party and children still remains after a dispensation has been obtained; that frequency of dispensations tempts other Catholics to seek them; that children in general, born of these unions, have not the same aversion to mixed marriages as, in general, children born of fully Catholic unions have. Above all, they appeal to experience, which shows that in spite of promises and so-called moral certainty of fulfillment, mixed marriages are causing huge losses throughout the world. They claim that, if those dispensations now given allegedly to prevent marriages *extra ecclesiam* were refused (unless there

were other weighty and objective reasons), mixed marriages and their undoubted evils would notably decrease. They admit that in the beginning, losses would increase; but claim that in a few years, the Church's gains would steadily and constantly increase. They say that when Catholics realized more clearly the mind of the Church from her refusal to grant dispensations except for obviously grave and urgent reasons, they would seek more earnestly for Catholic partners, and, as time went on, Catholic marriages would increase and mixed marriages decrease. This has actually happened in parts of Holland and U.S.A. It has also happened in Carthago.

The stricter practice is in conformity with Canon 1064 which reads: *Ordinarii aliique animarum pastores;*

1° *Fideles a mixtis nuptiis, quantum possunt, absterreant;*

2° *Si eas impedire non valeant, omni studio curent ne contra Dei et Ecclesiae leges contrahantur.*

When Cardinal van Rossum explained to Cardinal Gasparri, President of the Committee for the interpretation of the New Code, that the stricter policy was followed in several dioceses in Holland, Cardinal Gasparri asked him whether mixed marriages were prevented by such action. On being assured they were, he replied, "In that case, the practice is in perfect harmony with the Canon, which says, *si impedire non valeant.* This Canon states that when it is impossible to prevent a mixed marriage, it should be celebrated according to the laws of God and the Church; but when mixed marriages can be prevented, they should be prevented. (This private answer and interpretation was published by the Bishop of Haarlem in a letter to his clergy on July 14, 1918).

It seems that too many fear that many, if not most, of those who were refused a dispensation would marry *extra ecclesiam.* They overlook the fact that a multiplicity of dispensations is merely perpetuating the evils which undoubtedly flow from mixed marriages in Australia. Too frequent dispensations from any law weaken respect for it, and make people consider it as not *really* binding. In 1920 Archbishop Whiteside of Liverpool, England, said—"The strongest language of Sovereign Pontiffs on mixed marriages, delivered to a flock on Sunday, becomes on Monday nugatory and even a stumbling-block to them, if they find out that a dispensation has just been obtained, except it be

for reasons which public opinion would admit to be quite exceptional." (v. "Mixed Marriages and Their Remedies"—Ter Haar—English translation, page 72.)

Carthago results indicate that the fear of Catholics marrying *extra ecclesiam* in large numbers is quite unfounded. The opposite has happened there. Nearly all Catholics in Carthago seek for, and marry, Catholic partners.

Carthago's strict policy has paid rich dividends to the Church. We could truthfully claim, and substantiate by facts, that it has preserved more souls to the Church than is usually in equally large parishes which pursue a milder course regarding mixed marriages. Just as we can be too strict, so also we can be too lax. But in a matter of such vital importance to the salvation of souls and to the preservation and spread of the faith as fully Catholic marriages, one is justified in asking whether it is not better to err, if one does err, on the side of strictness rather than laxity.

I am not advocating a complete ban on mixed marriages; but, after seeing the extraordinary results obtained in Carthago, I have conceived the hope that these marriages can be notably reduced throughout Australia.

C. McMASTER, C.SS.R.

The Monastery, Ballarat, Victoria.

SHORT NOTICE

ALMANACCO CAPPUCCINO PER L'EMIGRANTE ITALIANO IN AUSTRALIA, Edited by A. M. Panciroli, O.F.M.Cap., Sydney, 1958. 47 pp.

Published by the Capuchin Fathers of Leichhardt, N.S.W., this little year-book contains a useful sketch of some main events in Australian history, information for Italians on the addresses and times of Masses, etc., in churches throughout Australia, where special attention is given to Italian Catholics, a list of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Continent, a list of the Italian Consular offices, practical and excellent advice with regard to the Sacraments and the manner in which the parish priests are to be consulted, some very practical points that will help the Italian in making his home among a new people, and finally, a complete calendar of the year, indicating the feasts of the ecclesiastical year.

This book should be of great value to the Italian emigrants even before they sight their new country, as it will serve as a guide for them. Throughout the Calendar a thought is given for each week. The great advantage of learning English is stressed and a list is given of the centres where English is taught. The Capuchin Fathers are to be congratulated on the excellence of this work, which it is to be hoped will prove popular among Italians.

T.V.

The Theology Of Mysteries, II.

The Cult Mystery may be defined as a sacred act of worship in which Christ's redemptive work is made present under a determined rite, so that men may come into contact with the saving acts of Christ's mortal life, re-live them with him and thus acquire their own salvation. The central act of christian worship consists in the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass, the sacred rite instituted by Christ at the Last Supper. In this article we shall endeavour to show how Casel applies the mystery-concept to the eucharistic sacrifice.

THE MASS AND THE CROSS

At the Last Supper on the evening before his death, Christ instituted a mystery which was to be celebrated by the Church till the end of time. On that day Christ gave to his disciples the mystery of his body and blood for them to celebrate. *Tradidit discipulis corporis et sanguinis sui mysteria celebranda.*[1] The Eucharist is the mystery of Christ's body and blood. The sacred rite performed by Christ signifies the presence of his body and blood; and the body and blood of Christ are made present beneath the sacred species. *Sacramenta id efficiunt quod figurant.* The bread is changed into Christ's body, the contents of the chalice are changed into his blood.

But the eucharistic mystery, the mystery of Christ's body and blood, implies far more than the Real Presence. In the Eucharist the mystery of Christ's passion is celebrated. The body of Christ is present, but it is the body given and immolated in sacrifice. The blood of Christ is present, but it is the blood shed in remission of sin, the blood of the New Testament. The sacred rite instituted by Christ clearly refers to his passion and death. It is a commemoration of the sacrifice of redemption enacted on Calvary. At the Last Supper Christ institutes the New Pasch. This sacred rite is the memorial of his passage from this world to the Father, when by the shedding of his blood he redeemed us from the power of darkness and transferred us into his kingdom.

The Eucharist is the memorial of an historical event, the

[1] Hanc igitur of Maundy Thursday.

saving sacrifice of the cross which gives life to the world. In the Eucharist the historical saving act of Christ's passion is signified, and the historical saving act of Christ's passion is made present. *Sacramenta id efficiunt quod figurant.* At the Last Supper Christ gives to his Church the power to re-actualise the sacrifice of redemption performed on the cross. The immolation of Calvary is realised and, as it were, embodied in sensible signs. The passion of Christ, the sacrificial act of Golgotha, has been delivered to the Church in a mystery, in a sacrament. The Church can now participate in the sacrifice offered by Christ for her redemption. She is intimately united with Christ as his Body, as his Bride. Whenever the eucharistic mystery is celebrated, she stands at the foot of the cross, offering and immolating her Head, and in union with him she offers herself.

When the mystery-concept is applied to the Eucharist, the sacrificial nature of the Mass stands out with a brilliant clarity. The Mass is a sacrifice because it signifies and makes present the sacrificial act of Christ on the cross. The Eucharist contains not simply the body and blood of Christ, but the very passion of Christ. It contains not simply the Christ who suffered, but the redemptive sufferings of Christ. The Eucharist is the sacrifice of the Cross, contained and made present in a sacrament, in a mystery. St. Cyprian refers to the eucharistic celebration as the sacrament of the Lord's passion and of our redemption. *Dominicae Passionis et nostrae redemptionis sacramentum.*[2] He declares that the sacrifice we offer is the passion of the Lord. *Passio est enim Domini, sacrificium quod offerimus.*[3] St. Gregory the Great pursues the same line of thought when he says: "In his mystery, Christ suffers again for us." *In suo mysterio pro nobis iterum patitur.*[4] The eucharistic sacrifice is the sacramental epiphany of Christ on Calvary.

This re-presentation of Calvary which takes place in the Mass is understood by Casel as a making present of the redemptive sacrifice in all its fulness as a saving act. Not only is the passion of Christ really present, but also the love, the obedience, the devotion which animated and informed the sufferings of our Saviour. By the consecration of bread and wine

---

[2]Epist. LXIII, 14; C. Bayard, Saint Cyprien Correspondence, tome II, p. 209.
[3]Epist. LXIII, 17; ibid. p. 211.
[4]Homil. in Evangelia, Lib. II, Homil. XXXVII, 7, P.L. 76, 1279.

the sacrifice of the immolation and death of Christ is re-actualised beneath the sacred species. Under the veil of the sacramental signs, Christ, the High Priest and Mediator of the New Testament, makes present the gift of love, the total, spiritual act of self-surrender that he made to his Father by his death on the cross. According to Dom Casel the exact statement of his own thought is best expressed in the words of the encyclical Mediator Dei. The Mass is an act of sacrificing in which Christ does what he did on the cross.

When the Eucharist is viewed as a mystery, we see that the Mass could never enter into conflict with the Cross as a second sacrifice of redemption. By his death on the altar of the Cross, Christ offered himself to God the Father once and for all. With the shedding of his own blood, the High Priest of the New Alliance entered into the Holy of Holies and accomplished an eternal redemption. By a single sacrifice Christ has realised, once and for all, the very purpose of sacrifice.

The people of the New Testament have but one sacrifice to offer, the sacrifice of the cross, the passion of Christ. The redemptive sacrifice which took place on Calvary under the veil of historical accidents is made present in the Eucharist under the veil of signs. There is a perfect numerical identity between the saving act once performed by Christ in the order of history and the saving act now present in the sacramental order. In the eucharistic celebration the work of Christ's redemptive sacrifice is present in and beneath the sacred symbols. Thus the Eucharist is a real sacrifice; but the Cross retains its place as the unique sacrifice of Christianity. The Mass is essentially a relative sacrifice. It is the real, objective commemoration of the one sacrifice of the Cross. "The Mass . . . is identical with the sacrifice of the cross because it is its memorial. Its character of a sacrifice rests essentially on its character of a memorial; it is essentially a sacrifice insofar as it is a memorial." [5]

The essential relation between the Mass and the Cross is clearly set forth by the Council of Trent. "One . . . and the same is the victim, one and the same is he who now offers by the ministry of his priests and he who then offered himself on the cross. The difference is only in the manner of offering." [6] All

---

[5]O. Casel, JLW, VIII, p. 176: cited from Th. Filthaut, La Theologie des Mysteres, p. 68.

[6]Sess. 22, c. 2; D. 940.

catholic theologians confess that the Mass and the Cross have the same priest and the same victim, that the Mass represents, commemorates and applies the sacrifice of the Cross. Very many theologians would maintain that the Mass is a sacrifice precisely insofar as it is a sacramental representation and reproduction of the sacrifice of the Cross. But Casel's doctrine is quite distinctive. In the Mass the saving *event* of Christ's passion is made present. The historical act of Calvary is realised in a mystery.[7] Beneath the sacred species there is the same priest, the same victim and the same sacrificial event as the Cross. The Eucharist is not simply the mystery of the real presence of Christ's body and blood; it is, above all else, the mystery of the real presence of the sacrifice of the Cross.

Dom Casel believes that the mystery-concept of sacrifice is far more than a theological theory. It is the traditional doctrine which is found in the primitive liturgical texts and in the patristic writings.

The Fathers of the Church consider the Eucharist as the *image* of the sacrifice of the Cross. The student who has been reared on the philosophy of Aristotle will fail to see the full import of this doctrine. He must remember that the Fathers of the Church were inspired by the Platonic concept of an image. For them the image is not a pure symbol; rather, it is the sensible appearance of a hidden reality. The reality which is represented, is present in the image. Hence, when the Fathers designate the Eucharist as the *image* of Christ's passion, they profess that the passion of Christ is objectively and really present under the sacred species. This concept of the Eucharist as the real presence of the sacrifice of the Cross prevailed up till the ninth century. It then became more and more obscured as a result of the Eucharistic heresies. Henceforth the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist gradually becomes the main object of theological interest.[8]

THE MASS AND THE WORK OF REDEMPTION

So far, the Mass has been considered as a re-presentation of the sacrifice of the Cross. But for Dom Casel the Mass involves

---

[7]In the Eucharist the historical event of Calvary is made present as a saving act. But the historical accidents, and the historical modes of time and place are not made present. In the Eucharist the historical saving act of Calvary has a sacramental mode of presence.

[8]Cfr. Filthaut, op.cit., p. 19, p. 61; M. Schmaus, Katholische Dogmatik, Band IV:I, p. 300 seq.

a re-presentation, a real objective presence, of the entire work of redemption. This means that the Incarnation, the passion and death, the resurrection and ascension, all the saving acts performed by Christ, are really present again in the eucharistic celebration. For Dom Casel, the Mass is necessarily a universal re-presentation of the entire work of redemption. "If the Mass is the real commemoration of the sacrifice offered by Christ for the redemption of men, then, in essential logic, it must also be a commemoration of all the phases of the saving work of the Lord. But everything is there under the aspect of sacrifice. That is why the passion is present at the centre, as the active offering of sacrifice. If, therefore, the Mass signifies and realises the Passion, these other acts are also signified and realised in it together with the redemptive sacrifice."[9]

The "essential logic," which argues from a re-presentation of the passion to a re-presentation of the entire work of redemption, depends on the fact that the mystery of salvation is one indivisible whole. The entire life of Christ contributes to the redemption of the human race. Each of the individual mysteries of Christ is, in its own way, the cause of our salvation; and they all constitute one great mystery of redemption. This mystery commences with the Incarnation and closes with the parousia, the second glorious coming of the Son of God. The divine work of salvation which is enclosed within these two events is a unified whole; and it cannot be broken into fragments. It is not possible to re-actualise one phase of the saving mystery without making the entire mystery present.

The essential unity of the saving mystery is seen in the very source of all the Christian mysteries, in the mystery of Christ. The supreme mystery of Christianity is the revelation of God in the Person of the Word Incarnate. With Christ, the invisible God appears in a visible human nature to bring salvation to humanity. This mystery of salvation commences with the Incarnation which is the union between heaven and earth, the sanctification of our human nature. But God has sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, as a sin-offering, so that the sins of men may die in his own flesh, so that by his bruises men may be healed.[10]

The mystery of salvation which begins in the Incarnation, continues throughout the mortal life of Christ and reaches its

---

[9]O. Casel, JLW, VI, p. 203; cited from Filthaut, p. 35.
[10]Cfr. Heb., VIII:3; I Peter II:22.

central point in the redemptive drama of Calvary. On Good Friday the Incarnate Word of God carried the sins of men to the cross. With his flesh, sin was nailed to the cross. With his body, sin died on the cross. The passion and death of Christ was "the total sacrifice of the God-Man, the liturgy of the sole, supreme Priest, the gift, full of love, of the Son immolating to his Father for the entire human race, the sacrifice alone worthy of the name, from which life flows forth for sinners.[11]

The mystery of redemption which commences with the Incarnation, which continues throughout the life of Christ and is achieved on the cross, reaches its apogee in the resurrection and the ascension. The glorification and the exaltation of Christ find their source in the Incarnation and the passion. It is by his abasement in assuming the flesh of sin and the form of a slave, it is by his obedience unto the death of the cross that Christ has been glorified and exalted, that he has received the name which is above all names, that he has become the Lord, the Kurios. By his passion and death Christ our High Priest has taken his seat in heaven at the right hand of the throne of Majesty. As the eternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech he has penetrated into the sanctuary of God where he has entered as our precursor.[12]

St. Paul has shown the essential unity of the Incarnation, death and exaltation of Christ in the magnificent text of the Philippians. "Jesus Christ, though he was in the condition of God, yet he did not cling avidly to his equality with God: rather, he emptied himself by taking the condition of a slave and becoming like unto men. And recognised in all like to a man, he humbled himself by obedience unto death, yea unto death upon a cross. For this reason God hath exalted him sovereignly and hath bestowed on him the name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus 'every knee should bend' in heaven, on earth and under the earth, and that 'every tongue should confess' that 'Jesus Christ is Lord' in the glory of God the Father."[13]

The passion and resurrection of Christ are intimately linked as a *transitus,* as a passage from death to life. The humiliation of the Cross is crowned by the resurrection which manifests the glory of Christ, the Lord. But this is not the final act in the great mystery of redemption. At the end of time the glory of Christ

---

[11]O. Casel, Le Mystere du Culte, p. 135-6.
[12]Cfr. Heb., VI:20.
[13]Philippians II:6-11.

will be publicly manifested to the entire world. After the resurrection it was revealed only to the witnesses chosen by God, and through them to the Church. But in the second and glorious parousia the Lord will come in his majesty to judge the world and bring to the faithful total and definitive salvation. The parousia will be an historical event, the final point of terrestrial history. But it will also be a saving event, the triumphant finale in the drama of redemption. "And as it is appointed to all men once to die, and thereafter cometh judgment, so also will Christ, offered once to bear the sins of many, appear a second time with no part in sin unto salvation for those who wait for him."[14]

Thus the life of Christ is conceived as a gigantic itinerary of salvation which goes from the womb of the Virgin to the throne of the divine majesty, from the first coming to the second coming. Our redemption rests on the fact that God became flesh, that this Man is the Son of God, that he suffered and died on the cross, that he has become the Kurios, the Lord, exalted in glory at the right hand of the Father. The mystery of salvation is an indivisible whole. The individual mysteries of Christ's life constitute a single design, a single economy of *eternal* redemption.[15]

While she lives in the joyful expectancy of the parousia the Church celebrates the mysteries of cult. These are the continuation and the application of the mysteries of Christ. In particular, the Eucharist is the sacred action which commemorates the great economy of salvation, and makes it present again for all generations until the end of the world. The Eucharist immediately and directly signifies the passion of Christ, but through it and with it the entire work of redemption is signified and made present under the aspect of sacrifice.

In the Eucharist the Incarnation is present as the first condition of sacrifice. On entering into the world Christ said: "Sacrifice and offering thou hast not desired, but a body thou hast prepared for me. In holocausts and sin-offerings thou hast taken no pleasure: then I said: Behold I come to do, O God, thy will."[16] All the saving acts of Christ's life are present as leading to the cross, as directed towards Calvary and the baptism of blood. This does not mean simply that Christ re-

---

[14]Heb., IX:28.
[15]O. Casel, Le Mystere du Culte, p. 133 seq.
[16]Heb. X:5-8.

actualises that interior attitude of soul by which he directed all the saving acts of his life towards the sacrifice of the cross. It means far more than this. The very acts themselves are made present in the eucharistic celebration. The passion of Christ is present as the central act of sacrifice, as the active offering of the sacrifice of redemption. The resurrection and the ascension are present in the Mass as the acts by which the Father accepts and crowns the sacrifice of Christ. Finally, the parousia is present as the final term of the sacrifice of redemption. Thus the total work of salvation is re-presented in the eucharistic mystery.

Dom Casel is convinced that the objective presence of the entire economy of redemption is demanded by the liturgical texts of the Anamnesis. In the *Unde et memores* the Latin Church presents the eucharistic celebration as a commemoration of the passion of Christ, of his resurrection and of his ascension into the glory of heaven. The word *memores* must not be understood merely in its modern subjective sense of a mental recollection, as though the Church were simply inviting her children to meditate on the passion, resurrection and ascension. Rather, the memory is realised in and by the liturgical action. The word memory implies an action, as it does in the command of institution. *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.* This commemorative action is envisaged by the liturgy as a real, objective memorial, as a commemoration full of reality, which makes present the passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ.

The corresponding prayer in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom presents the Mass as a commemorative celebration of the cross, the resurrection, the ascension, the session at the right hand of the Father and the second glorious parousia.

Thus the Eucharistic celebration is the real objective memorial of all the redemptive actions of Christ from the Incarnation to the glorious parousia. This presence of the total mystery of salvation is perfectly summarised in the liturgy of the ninth Sunday after Pentecost. *Quoties huius hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur.*

C. TIERNEY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

(To be continued)

Charity And Ethics

When viewed from the lofty standpoint of supernatural theology, charity occupies an undisputed place in the moral life of the Christian.[1] St. Thomas, following the teaching of Scripture and the Fathers, places the perfection of the Christian life in charity.[2] His summation of their teaching is contained in the proposition: *Per se quidem et essentialiter perfectio Christianae vitae consistit in caritate, principaliter quidem secundum dilectionem Dei, secundario autem secundum dilectionem proximi.*[3] Scripture makes it abundantly clear that our perfection consists in loving the Triune God: *Plenitudo legis dilectio.*[4]

St. Paul exalts supernatural charity above the charisms, above the theological virtues of faith and hope. St. John, the Evangelist of charity, gives the fundamental reason why charity renders a man perfect: *Deus caritas est.* "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is from God. And everyone who loves is born of God, and knows God. He who does not love does not know God; for God is love."[5]

This charity of which theology speaks is supernatural in its object, in its motive and in its principle. The object of our charity is the Triune God of whom Revelation speaks to us; our motive for love is based upon faith revealing God as infinitely good and lovable. We love God by our wills perfected by the virtue of charity and aided by actual grace. As for the secondary object of this one virtue of charity—our neighbour—it is again God we

---

[1]St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, L. XV, c. 22 (*P.L.*, t. XLI, c. 467). *De Moribus Ecclesiae*, L. 1, c. 15, n. 25 (*P.L.*, t. XXXII, c. 1322). *Ep. ad Volusianum*, c. V. n, 17 (*P.L.*, 6. XXXIII, c. 524). *In Ps.* LXXXIX, n. 17 (P.L., t. XXXVII, c. 1148). St. Jerome, *In Gal.*, L. III, c. B, n. 22 (*P.L.*, t. XXVI, c. 418).

[2]The Scholastic Doctors are unanimous on this point: St. Bonaventure, *in III Sent.*, dist. 25, a. 2. q. 5. Scotus, *in III Sent.*, dist. 26, a 4. Durandus, *in III Sent.*, dist. 23, a. 9.

[3]*Summa Theol.*, II-II, 184, 3.

[4]*Rom.* 13. 10.

[5]*I John* 4. 7-16

love in him.[6] We love an image, a reflection, of the divine perfections; our motive is the divine perfections inasmuch as they are manifested, expressed in our neighbour. We love in grace and with the assistance of actual grace.

It is clear that Ethics, when it speaks of charity, will be discussing something other than the supernatural virtue of charity. Nevertheless, faith acts as at least a negative norm of truth for the philosopher; it sets problems for us in a light quite different from that in which unaided reason, in man's actual historical setting, would envisage them. It helps the philosopher to avoid cul-de-sacs and hints at solutions to problems which the Christian philosopher can sometimes attain by natural reason. It is a question whether Christian Ethics has always sufficiently explored the problems raised for it by faith on the subject of charity.

The Christian recognition of a personal God gives a character to Ethics which Platonic or Aristotelian Ethics could not have had. Many moral acts, such as adoration, are inconceivable for the ethical man whose supreme good is impersonal. With the Christian Revelation there came, moreover, a revolution in the way moral data is accessible to man, a revolution which perhaps has not been fully appreciated by ethicians;[7] for there are two ways of perceiving moral values, just as there are objectively two aspects to moral values. There is an outer aspect to moral value which is grasped more easily by reason working on data known by its natural powers, and there is an inner aspect which has become readily accessible to unaided reason working on data made philosophically available through the Christian Revelation. This latter aspect is of decisive importance for any discussion of charity's role in Ethics. By this it is not meant that Christian Ethics uses Revelation as a premise in its reasonings, but simply that the visible reality of Christian moral behaviour and holiness, insofar as it may be grasped by unaided reason, presented new facts whose explanation opened the door for more penetrating philosophical analyses of the natural virtues.

---

[6] *Summa Theol.*, II-II, 25, 1.

[7] See E. Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1936), ch. 16, where the author outlines the contributions to philosophic moral problems, made possible through the influence of Judaeo-Christian Revelation.

St. Thomas' profound insight into the nature of supernatural charity points the way for the ethician's examination of the role of natural charity. He calls theological charity the form of all the virtues, since charity orientates the acts of all the other virtues to their ultimate end. Since supernatural charity alone of the virtues is ordained to Infinite Goodness *per seipsam*, it can lend to the other virtues an orientation to its end. Through it they participate in that orientation to the ultimate God. For in moral matters the form of an act is viewed from the standpoint of the act's end. The reason for this is that the principle of moral activity is the will, whose object and quasi-form is its end. But the form of an act always follows the form of the agent. Hence it follows that in moral matters what gives the act of the will its ordination to an end, gives it its form. It is clear also that what ordains acts of the various virtues to their end is charity; accordingly charity is that which gives the form to all the other virtues and hence it is called the form of all the virtues, for virtues are so called with relation to formed acts.[8] This theological speculation of St. Thomas has made evident a truth about supernatural charity which may help the philosopher to investigate the role of natural charity. Is natural charity's role in ethics similar to, parallel to that which divine charity plays in the supernatural life? Does Christianity offer the philosopher, as a philosopher, intimations of the directions in which he will find a solution to this problem? Obviously Revelation cannot provide the philosopher with premises for his argument. But through Revelation new data may become available for the unaided reason to work on. The fact that the holiness of the Church is divine, entitatively supernatural, does not prevent the man without faith from grasping a qualitative difference in her holiness compared to that of other institutions. The holiness of the Church, the Vatican Council made clear, is a sign of her divinity open to reason's perception.[9] The holiness of Christ has been admitted by many who lack faith in His Divinity; His holiness is one of the standard apologetic arguments for His Divinity, and Apologetics proceeds by *reason* to establish its conclusions. The question, then, is: does the holiness of Christ

---

[8]II-II, 33, 8; L-LL, 62, 4; LL-II, 166, 7, ad 1; *De Caritate* 3; *De Malo* 8, 2; *De Veritate* 14, 5.

[9]Denziger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (25th edition), 1799.

offer data for the philosopher's investigation of the place that charity should have in Ethics? Historically it seems quite clear that it does.

In encountering a situation in which a moral value is at stake, the human person at once recognises the *obliging* character of the value in question, whether he lives before the advent of Christ or after. Man, when he has unlawfully seized the goods of another, grasps at once that he is obliged to return them. This is what might be called the obliging character, the outer character of the value of justice. Justice in its unalterable majesty shines up before the thief, and he is aware of the dignity and metaphysical power of the value of justice. Human reason could know that God is the source of this obliging power which he acknowledges—God as infinite Lawgiver, infinite Judge.

A personal God to whom obedience is due is accessible to human reason, yet unaided reason does not seem to have discovered Him.[10] Socrates, the classical type of ethical idealist, was a man to whom the outer, the obliging aspect of moral values was most evident. He represents the ethical man of the advent situation, the man whose life was directed by conscience in full contact with those moral values which he knew, and under the aspect according to which they were data accessible to him. Yet it seems certain that to Socrates moral values were not seen in any direct relationship to a personal God.

With the coming of Christ, the Epiphany of God, an overwhelming change takes place in the way that moral values are 'given', presented, knowable by man's reason. That aspect of moral values which was given before Christ is not dissolved at His coming, but fulfilled.[11] The obliging character which was evident before is now completed by a new datum which makes clear the inner, the lovable character of moral values. From an epistemological point of view, something is revealed, made evident at Christ's coming that was not clearly evident before. If before His coming the moral situation carried a moral character, a quality of majesty and implacable command, it now

---

[10] *ibid.*, 1785m 2145.

[11] Yves de Montcheuil, *Aspects de l'Eglise* (Paris; Cerf, 1949), p. 69

carries also an invitation to love. Justice is now *given* as lovable. The inner harmony, the inner suavity, the inner beauty and lovability of justice is epistemologically revealed in such a way as to motivate not only submission but love. Moral values are now seen as exercising not only a power to command but also to draw us, to solicit our love as well as our obedience. The holiness of Christ and the holiness of the Christian Saints have enriched the moral values with a beauty that touches the heart as well as moves the will. The decision to obey is no longer the only response which the ethical man feels himself drawn, and rightly drawn, to make; he knows that the proper response is obedience *in love.*

Christ's holiness thus enthroned charity at the heart of every moral virtue. He disclosed the inner lovableness of each virtue in such a way that a new attitude is possible towards them: love. This is not to say that charity absorbs the other virtues or acts as a specifying form to them. Rather it is called a form *effective.* In the sphere of nature, beauty has always exercised this power to touch the heart, to attract love.[12] Justice, fortitude, prudence, since the advent of Christ, are now given with this appealing character of beauty, so that they, too, properly suggest the response of love.

Before Judaeo-Christian Revelation, man could have known that morality had as its *source* a personal Lawgiver. Before Christian Revelation, the Judaeic Revelation made evident the connection of morality with this personal God as a thing commanded by Him, the Author of Natures. Upon the occasion of Christ's teaching, natural reason can understand that moral goodness is not conformity to a mere ideal or law derivate from a personal Lawgiver; instead, goodness is understood to be totally fulfilled in a Person. Subsistent Goodness has an absolute Personality. Apart from, not because of, He being the Second Person of the Trinity, Christ's personal way of acting and His doctrine enabled men to see (were the *occasional* cause of their seeing) what they could clearly have seen if they had more

---

[12]Jaime Castiello, S.J., *Humane Psychology of Education* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1936), pp. 42 sqq., discusses the importance of this factor in moral education.

attentively considered the order of being about them. Natural reasoning *can* prove that God is personal, that the source of law is personal, that the source of law is subsistent Goodness. Christ was the occasion for men to *realise* what they could have known without faith before His coming. Now, goodness assumes a new character when it is seen from this point of view. Natural charity, in its fulness, is possible only towards a person, and charity is the perfect response to a person.[13] When the central object of morality, God, is seen to be personal, charity interpenetrates all our moral responses.[14] The fundamental act of morality is understood to be love. If one is confronted with an individual value, such as justice, he fulfills an obligation towards that value-situation not merely because a Lawgiver commands it, but also because the inner delectability of justice is made evident in Christ, and because the intrinsic connection of justice with Christ, evident to us, motivates our love so that we obey in love. By this we mean simply that the pagan ethician, perceiving Christ whom he believes to be a human ethical personality, listening to His doctrine which he does not believe to be revealed, can, by reflection with his natural reason, grasp that certain of these truths are conformed to man's ethical nature. He can, by reason, see that natural charity is due to God, since God is a Person, subsistent Goodness. That he can do so is proved in natural theology. Once the inner lovableness of moral values is perceived, love of God becomes almost a prolonged act, prolonged through every moral response. Every moral act reflects its moral object, and now the moral object is seen in a new way. Moral goodness can be seen to be commanded by a Person Who is subsistent Goodness.

The preceding discussion was concerned with the role of *natural* charity, a role at which reason can arrive by speculating on certain data made more *easily* accessible to it after Christian Revelation. Let us turn now to a consideration, not of the ethical man of abstract moral philosophy, but of the Christian in his concrete existential situation, that is, the Christian living not only by ethical norms but by norms of faith as well. No response that is given to-day by a Christian man to a concrete moral

---

[13] *Summa Theol.*, II-II, 25, 3.
[14] Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Christian Ethics*, McKay, N.Y., p. 178.

situation is given without objectively containing a response to the Person Christ. His obedience consequently should be penetrated with love. The obedient decision of the will is not all that is commanded of the moral man.[15] The love of his will is also called for, because the proper response to the Person Christ Sum as well as Source of all virtues, is love. Moral values have to-day the added function of acting as windows to the face of Christ. The test of the validity of a moral act is also its compatibility with the face of Christ, exemplary cause of all moral perfection.

Pre-Christian Ethics could not have had charity at its core in the same manner, because never before was the inner lovability of every moral act made so evident; for the connection of morality with a personal God was not actually grasped.

It is not perhaps surprising that attempts have been made, in the history of religious philosophy, to dissolve this element of love into something that pre-Christian ethics had long grasped as manageable in terms of its own framework. The *Christian* conscience, however, relying on Revelation, has resisted any attempt to dispossess charity of its unique moral position.

Those who would say that the love which should be found in the centre of our moral life is identified with the disposition of our will to obey, to conform to law, may be in danger of eliminating what is proper to charity for love is not obedience; nor obedience love, though it may prove love's presence. Charity remains a self-donation; an extraposition of the self is attempted by charity. The Angelic Doctor expresses it briefly: *amor facit extasim*. The phenomenology of charity is probably best begun where its nature is easily detected, in love of spouse or love of friendship, and then those elements may be eliminated which result from the imperfect condition in which charity is found there.

One of the prime difficulties of those who would dissolve the specific element of love in man's moral life is this: love cannot

[15]St. Francis de Sales,*Traite de L'Amour* de Dieu, L. XI, Ch.9.

[16]Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Fundamental Moral Attitudes*, Longmans, N.Y. p. 65.

be commanded, hence we cannot be responsible for its presence or absence; obedience suffices. This difficulty rests squarely upon several suppositions which must be challenged. It presupposes that the *direct* sphere of the will's influence is the only morally relevant sphere. Secondly, it ignores the fact that freedom and responsibility extend to affective states when these possess a meaningful, conscious relation to a morally important object. The decisive power that man possesses of allowing himself to be motivated by an object, of conforming to an object, of permitting himself to be moved by an object, is by them considered morally neutral. It is true that one cannot initiate freely and independently of an object such responses as joy, grief, love, but one can co-operate with the object motivating that response, one can prepare and dispose the soul to make that response.[16]

He who obeys all of the commandments of God the Lawgiver certainly loves; but among the commandments, even of the *natural* law, one is already primal: to love. The fulfillment of duty is a response to the outer, obliging character of moral values, and was grasped long before the advent of Christianity. No will-to-obey can substitute for charity which of its essence implies confrontation with a Person. Charity always presupposes an I-Thou situation, while obedience's relation to a person is more extrinsic to the personal element in the situation.

If the analysis of charity is begun from 'self-love', which is an equivocal term, it will not be easy to reach the specific element of natural charity which reason can grasp by considering Christian life. Self-love can mean a pre-given, existential solidarity with the self that not even my will can alter. Our situation towards ourselves is so different from our situation towards others that it is not easy to begin with self-love and come to a clear knowledge of love of God or other persons. The result of beginning with the unconscious presupposition that charity must be explained in terms of self-love may be that we desubstantialise the very constituent elements of charity. Self-donation, the *intentio unionis,* delight in another person, transcendence of the self's interests may disappear in such an analysis. The original sense of love, as experience gives it to us, is love of another person, and the analysis of charity is best begun there, lest charity and obedience be too easily equivalated.

It is interesting to note that recent thought concerning supernatural charity is emphasising even more strongly than previously the unitive function of charity in the moral life.[17] The morality of Christianity has charity as its core. If it has been sometimes presented in such a way as to resemble a system of duties more rigorous and more precise than that of other religions, and so elevated as to require Revelation, this presentation is not complete. Christian morality would then be a continuation of Judaism, even a perfected Judaism, with more emphasis on the interiority of morals, but it would be nothing specifically new.[18] The result of this conception of Christianity is a casuistry of the obligatory on one side and 'generosity', 'works of supererogation' on the other. Christian morals are more than a set of obligations promulgated by a lawgiver, the observance of which offers sufficient proof of the love of God. Christianity makes an appeal to a total love, to a complete transformation in Christ. It is penetrated with charity because our relations with a personal God who is subsistent Goodness are not resolvable into the relations which exist on the level of legal obligations. The concept of 'sufficient' love, probed by the observance of the minimum obligatory, could, if pushed too far, be at variance with the very notion of charity.[19] Charity contents itself only with total donation. The Christian life proposes a gift of the self to God, carried out in all the moral activities of man's life. Charity occcupies a central position in this moral life, informing all the virtues and lending to the moral life a certain inquietude as long as there remains something to give. As supernatural theology appreciates to-day and has always appreciated, charity is the queen of virtues and the unifying bond of perfection. The question remains: has the light which this Christian Revelation offers to the natural ethician in his natural speculations been sufficiently appreciated?

St. Clement of Rome, writing about the year 95 in his first

---

[17]See G. Gilleman, S.J., "Eros ou Agape: comment centrer la conscience chretienne?" Nouvelle Revue Theologique, 72 (1950), 3-26 113-133, who describes an attempt to reorganise Moral Theology about the notion of supernatural charity.

[18]Yves de Montcheuil, Melanges Theologiques, (Paris: Aubier, 1944), p. 354.

[19]ibid., p. 358

[20]*First Epistle of Saint Clement to the Corinthians*, c. XLIX.

Epistle to the Corinthians, praises supernatural charity in terms which offer an indication of the place that the virtue of charity should have in the ethical life of man:

> Qui caritatem in Christo habet, exsequatur Christi mandata. Vinculum caritatis Dei quis potest enarrare? Altitudo, ad quem evehit caritas, inenarrabilis est. Caritas nos Deo adglutinat, caritas peccatorum multitudinem tegit, caritas omnia sustinet, omnia patienter tolerat . . . in caritate omnes Dei electi sunt perfecti, sine caritate nihil Deo acceptum est. Videte, dilecti, quam magna et admiranda sit caritas, et quod perfectio ejus nequit enarrari[20].

ROBERT W. GLEESON, S.J.

Fordham University,

New York, U.S.A.

Moral Theology

PROBLEMS CONCERNING MASS STIPENDS

Dear Rev. Sir,

It is stated in can. 830 of the Code of Canon Law that when a person offers a sum of money for the application of Masses, the number of Masses should be determined according to the amount of the stipend which obtains in the place where the donor resides, unless there is a legitimate presumption that he wished otherwise.

Would you kindly comment on the clause of the law *nisi aliam fuisse eius intentionem legitime praesumi debeat,* as applied to the following cases in which no mention is made of the usual stipend, either by the donor or by the priest?

1. A donor gives £125 for Masses. The priest says: "I will say 250 Masses," and the donor replies: "That is all right."

2. A donor writes: "I would like to have some Masses. I am enclosing the Dues as well." Then, in one cheque, is the sum of £15. When asked how many Masses she wished, the reply was: "I always leave that to yourself."

3. A note which says: "Offering for Mass for the deceased members of my family." One pound was enclosed. Would the priest be bound to say more than one Mass?

FRANKLINUS.

REPLY

In these three cases, it can be reasonably and lawfully presumed that the donor wished to give an amount above the fixed diocesan stipend of five shillings for the Masses requested.

A priest is entitled by an established and approved custom of the Church to accept an alms or stipend for the application of a Mass.[1] The custom has its remote origins in the early practice of the faithful, who made offerings of bread and wine on the occasion of the celebration of the Eucharist. What was necessary for the Sacrifice and the Communion of the people was placed on the altar, while the remainder was distributed among the clergy and also devoted to relieving the poor. In course of time, especially in places where wine was not so easily procurable, money

[1]Can. 824, par. 1.

was given instead of the offerings in kind to provide the matter of the sacrifice. The collection made in our churches on Sundays at the Offertory could well be a present-day survival of a custom as old as Christianity itself. The gifts of the people were used to provide the necessaries for divine worship, among which the support of a priest to offer the Sacrifice must be considered as of first importance. From the eighth century, the practice of making a gift to a priest to celebrate a Mass and apply its fruits for the benefit of the donor seems to have become widespread.[2] There is evidence of legislation to control this practice in Councils held at Rome under Pope Eugenius II (826) and again during the Pontificate of Leo IV (an. 853).[3] Without doubt, the custom was universally recognised from the twelfth century; it is approved by the Church in her legislation and regulated by the prescriptions of canons 824-844 of the Code of Canon Law.

The right to a stipend for the application of Mass is based immediately on a contract between the donor and the celebrant. The people in general are bound to contribute to the support of their pastors who exercise the sacred ministry on their behalf, and in much the same way, individuals who request the application of a special Mass for their own spiritual benefit can be bound to give something towards the support of the priest who uses the powers of his Priesthood for their particular advantage.

A quasi-contract exists between the pastor and his people to the effect that he will work for the salvation of their souls and use his priestly mediation for that purpose, and they, on the other hand, will be responsible for his decent support. Between the donor of the Mass stipend, however, and the priest who undertakes to celebrate and apply the Mass, an explicit contract comes into force. Both parties agree: the donor to give the stipend, and the priest to apply the Mass. It is not a contract of buying and selling; and, indeed, if it were, would be forbidden by the divine law as simony. The fruits of the Mass are in the spiritual order and the offering which makes up the stipend is very much part of the temporal and material order. The exchange of one for the other would be an irreverence to the most holy

---

[2]Prümmer. Manuale Theologiae Moralis (Ed. octava) vol. III, n. 262; Cappello. De Sacramentis (Ed. quarta) vol. I. n. 631 seqq.; Coronata. De Sacramentis. (1943) vol. I. n. 259.

[3]Mansi: XIV. col. 1005. Presbyteri nullius blandiantur aut suadeantur sermonibus ut non omnium ad se concurrentium in quibuslibet sacris locis oblationes ad missarum solemnitates recipiant.

Sacrifice of the Mass. We have, rather, one of those contracts which have not a special name, and so are called *contractus innominati; do ut facias.* I do something for the priest in a material way, and he binds himself to do something of spiritual value for me—the exercise of his Priesthood on my behalf. Material support for the ministers of the Church by reason of their labours for the people is considered by St. Paul as their right. "Know you not that they who work in the holy place eat the things that are in the holy place; and they that serve the altar partake with the altar? So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel."[4] And Our Lord Himself declared that the labourer is worthy of his hire or his meat, when He told his disciples to take nothing with them when they were sent to preach the doctrine of the Kingdom of God.[5]

In order to avoid even the appearance of trading or profitable transactions in Mass stipends, the Church has enacted wise rules in the section of the Code referred to above (Lib. III. pars. I, Titulus III, Art. IV). Among other things, the local Ordinary is competent to fix the amount of the offering or stipend for his Diocese, if possible, by decree of the Diocesan Synod. No priest may demand a larger stipend than is determined by the Episcopal law. If the Bishop has not exercised his right to legislate what is to be the stipend, then the custom of the Diocese must be followed.[6] A priest may accept a stipend larger than usual, if it is spontaneously offered; and likewise he may bind himself to apply a Mass for a smaller stipend, unless the Bishop has forbidden it.[7] (The authority of the Bishop to forbid the taking of an amount less than the Diocesan stipend would seem to be to ensure there was no appearance of trading or undue solicitude in the quest for Mass intentions, to the detriment of those who cannot afford to be content with a lower stipend).

The canon referred to by our correspondent would seem to deal directly with a question other than that to which he applies it. It would solve a problem such as this: Caius, who at the moment is in a diocese where the stipend is fixed by law or custom at ten shillings, offers a pound to a priest, who eventually transfers the Masses to a friend in another diocese where the stipend is five shillings. It is taken for granted that the intention

---

[4] 1 Cor. 9:13-14.
[5] Mt. 10:10; Lc. 10:7.
[6] Can. 831.
[7] Can. 832.

of the donor was to request two Masses, no matter where they were said, as the number is to be calculated according to what would it normally have been in the place where the donor was when the Masses were asked for. (*Morabatur* implies "actual presence" rather than "residence.") His intention would be lawfully presumed to be different, if he expressly wished that the Masses be said in the place where the stipend were lower (or higher).

Perhaps the questions submitted are better answered by an application of can. 832, which permits a priest to accept a stipend larger than what is fixed, if it is freely offered. Sometimes, the intention to offer a more generous stipend will be manifested without any possibility of doubt; on other occasions, a prudent conjecture can be made as to the desire of the donor, and there may be cases where the doubt remains insoluble. When there is no evidence that the person asking for the Masses meant the stipend to be in excess of the usual amount, the number must be calculated according to the amount fixed by diocesan law or legitimate custom. In most dioceses of Australia, as far as we are aware, the stipend is five shillings.

Let us examine the cases submitted.

1. The donor offered £125 and agreed that 250 Masses should be said for his intentions. By celebrating and applying the stipulated number of Masses, the priest fulfilled his obligation. It may appear, at first sight, that he acted contrary to can. 831, par. 1 by asking for more than the diocesan stipend. But his remarks may well be understood to contain merely a proposal, which the donor was free to accept or reject. If he rejected it, the priest would most likely have to ask him to give a smaller offering for fewer Masses, as the obligation of 500 Masses is not one which any priest would be anxious to assume. At any rate, unless he could foresee that some other priest or priests would take some of the Masses to say them for him, he could not accept them, as he is forbidden to accept more personal obligations for Masses than he can celebrate within a year.[8] Further, a person who gives the sum of £125 for Masses is more than normally devoted to the Church and would willingly wish to be generous in his offering. In the supposition, then, that the priest's reply to the effect that he would say 250 Masses was no more than a manner of enquiring whether the donor would be satisfied,

[8]Can. 835.

there was an explicit agreement between himself and the priest; and both were content. The readiness with which the donor answered, "That is all right," would seem to support the contention that he freely agreed to a proposal that was accepted without bargaining, and that he acted with full knowledge and consent.

2. After the customary amount of parochial dues was deducted from the cheque of £15, a considerable sum would remain to be set aside for Mass stipends. Since the donor is content to leave the number of Masses to the discretion of the priest, he fulfils his obligation in justice, provided he says some Masses. There is good reason to believe that the lady does not wish to limit the stipend to the sum fixed by diocesan law. A reliable guide is the amount the donor has given in the past when requesting Mass to be offered for her intentions. If there be no past experience to draw upon, we suggest that a Mass for each ten shillings would certainly meet the demand.

3. The offering of a pound for a Mass is not unheard of. Since the request was for Mass (in the singular), we may reasonably conclude that only one Mass was sought. Of course, in a particular case, there may be evidence based on a knowledge of the donor's financial status, disposition with regard to making gifts, etc., that he meant otherwise; but if the request be interpreted solely on the words in which it was couched, the priest who receives the stipend and says one Mass has no further obligation.

THE USE OF NARCOTICS

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Would you kindly explain the morality of the use of narcotics which are administered to relieve pain, and may have the effect of depriving the patient of the use of reason?

2. If the patient were near death, would it be lawful to administer a drug to induce a profound sleep, in which it is foreseen he will die?

A.C.T.

REPLY

1. The use of drugs for the relief of pain is in itself a lawful procedure, though there are dangers to be guarded against. Morphine, cocaine, codeine and other drugs of a like kind are all part of God's creation and are made for the use and benefit of man. Administered in proper doses by a skilled and

conscientious physician, they have beneficial results and aid in the restoration of health, or at least in making some illnesses more tolerable. Their toxic effect can be dangerous and an overdose may be fatal. Used too freely, there is a probability that the patient will become addicted to them. Some persons are more likely to form an addiction than others; and it is not always possible for the physician to know beforehand the type of patient he is dealing with. Hence, the risk of addiction and its harmful consequences should be taken into account when weighing the advisability of prescribing drugs of this kind. In general, they should be used sparingly, administered under supervision and discontinued when the need for them has ceased.

Taken in sufficient quantities, they bring about loss of consciousness. In cases of severe pain, the loss of consciousness may be a blessing, giving needed rest to the patient and allowing the recuperative forces of nature to have their effect. The temporary loss of the use of reason, moreover, is an effect which is not forbidden, provided there is a sufficient cause. To prevent great pain or to alleviate or end it, would be cause sufficient to administer a drug which leaves the patient unconscious even for a considerable time. This is the practice followed in ordinary medical procedure, and is justified on the principle that each of our faculties exists for the good of the whole body, and it is lawful to deprive ourselves of the use of one faculty that our general well-being be promoted. If we did not submit to the effects of the drug, great suffering would have to be endured, and perhaps permanent disability or even death might follow. In less serious cases where the pain is more tolerable, it would be lawful to administer a smaller dose of the drug, but not to the extent that loss of the use of reason would follow.

A group of drugs which differ from the narcotics are what are popularly called "tranquilisers." They have, it is claimed, a sedative effect without any accompanying drowsiness. Under proper supervision and in selected cases they are undoubtedly very useful, especially in the treatment of nervous disorders. Taken to excess they can be harmful and it has been said they may even affect the personality of the patient. If they are intended to calm unreasonable fears and fit the sick person to fulfil his ordinary duties in life, they are something to be grateful for. However, it would seem that recourse to them should not be had for the ordinary stress and strain of daily worries. They are a medicine and are for those whose illness

requires them. In an emergency, and under the direction of a physician who weighs the good results against the probable evil consequences, there can be no objection to taking them.

2. The last moments of our conscious life are most precious. The eternal salvation of a sinful man who has not made his peace with God depends on how he makes use of them. The devout person, who waits death serenely as the happy release from this vale of tears, can profit by his sufferings and resignation to increase his glory and satisfy for his transgressions. In the latter case—not to mention the former—there is no comparison between the temporal good to be gained by the alleviation of bodily suffering and the loss sustained in the supernatural order. It has been argued by those whose faith is wanting that it is more merciful to end the patient's sufferings and allow him to die in peace. Faith, on the other hand, teaches that it is really an advantage to bear distress patiently for the short time that remains, and so appear before God better prepared to give an account of this mortal life. "The sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."[9]

Nevertheless, it is sometimes lawful to relieve the extreme suffering of a dying person by the administration of a drug which deprives him of consciousness which he never recovers. The conditions under which such a procedure may be permitted are as follows:—

(a) The consent of the patient must be freely given. A human being has a right to the integrity of his members and the possession of all his faculties. For their preservation and proper use he is responsible to God from Whom he receives them. His own dominion over them and power to dispose of them is strictly limited by the purpose for which the Creator gave them to him. No one has a right to deprive him of them, not even the supreme authority of the State, except in punishment for some serious crime. The physician's authorisation comes from the patient, who seeks the professional aid of his doctor to perform what he is incompetent to do for himself. The relatives have no power over the bodies of their kin, and the duty of piety would urge that they protect his rights rather than violate them. A child who has not yet reached the age of reason would be dependent on his parents, and they would be in a

[9]Rom. 8:18.

position to decide the matter for him; and the same would be true of the lawful guardians of one who was insane. To administer a drug which will render a dying man unconscious, without first obtaining his consent, is an act of injustice.

(b) It must be morally certain that the sick man has made every preparation for death. This includes, first and foremost, the preparing of his soul by reception of the last Sacraments. To deprive a dying person of the helps given by Our Lord for his last moments is a most serious matter; and if it means endangering his eternal salvation, no greater sin against the virtue of fraternal charity could be imagined. Preparation for death also means that his temporal affairs are put in order, i.e., arrangements are made to satisfy any obligations in justice, charity and piety he may have. These are usually attended to by the making of a Will, the appointment of an executor of his estate, and providing for his dependants to the best of his ability. If these matters are not arranged much confusion and even injustice may possibly ensue after his death.

(c) The sufferings he has to undergo must be more than he can be expected reasonably to tolerate. While there would be an obligation to bear ordinary pain and discomfort, especially when it is soon to come to an end in death, there is no clear obligation to endure what is morally beyond the limits of human fortitude. It is true that the dying man's conscious life is shortened, but conscious life is shortened by a narcotic administered at any other time during life, and the shortening of conscious life for the relief of unsupportable pain is justified by the principle of totality. The good of the whole man is the first consideration, and if he is better in a narcotic sleep than suffering excruciating pain, may he not submit to the drug? It is only *per accidens* that on this occasion he will never awake from it, but the principle which permits the administration of a narcotic applies essentially in the same way for every period of life. This reservation, however, should be made: The last moments of our earthly existence are of the greatest value, and so a more serious cause is required to justify passing into unconsciousness, artificially and deliberately induced, at that crisis than on an occasion when the danger of death does not enter the consideration.

(d) Finally, it is usually laid down that the drug administered to a sick person must not notably shorten his life, though some slight abbreviation of life may be permitted as an

effect proportionate to the good result which is sought, i.e., relief from pain. In this case, however, the patient is at death's door, independent of any human interference. What must be guarded against is a dose out of proportion to his condition, which would in itself be sufficient to cause death. All that is permitted is sufficient to relieve the pain. This may be the occasion of death sooner than would otherwise happen; but the dose given must never be lethal, in all the circumstances of the case.

To sum up: A dying man, who has made spiritual and temporal preparation for his departure from this world, and is suffering very severe pain, may request his physician to administer a narcotic which would have the effect of terminating his rational life, and to some extent shorten what still remains of his natural life.

BINATION ON WEEK DAYS

Dear Rev. Sir,

What circumstances are called for to justify a priest's celebrating Mass twice other than on Sunday or a Holiday of Obligation?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY

A priest may not celebrate Mass twice on a week day except by virtue of an Apostolic Indult. The circumstances required will be mentioned in the text of the Indult.

Except on Christmas Day and the Commemoration of All Souls, when each priest may celebrate three Masses, it is not lawful to celebrate more than once. This is the general rule laid down in can. 806. Immediately, there are two exceptions noted:

(a) Mass may be repeated by virtue of an Apostolic Indult, or

(b) with the authorisation of the local Ordinary. The Ordinary may permit Mass to be celebrated again only on feasts of precept, when on account of the shortage of priests, a notable portion of the people could not otherwise satisfy their obligation. Nor may the Ordinary allow more than two Masses to be celebrated by the same priest.

As the law restricting the number of times a priest may celebrate Mass is of purely ecclesiastical origin, the Church may modify it or dispense from it. There is reason to believe that some of the Australian Ordinaries have requested and obtained

from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda the faculty to permit their priests to binate even on week days. Whether the Bishop of the Diocese to which our correspondent is attached enjoys this faculty, could be discovered on enquiry at the Diocesan Chancery. The conditions for use of the Indult could also be learned from the same source.

The Ordinary of a Diocese that we know of has the faculty *permittendi Sacerdotibus ut bis Missam celebrent etiam diebus ferialibus quando necessitas fidelium occurrat.* Taking this faculty as it stands, we shall add a few words in explanation, but wish to stress that other Ordinaries may enjoy faculties which are either more or less extensive. The faculty of which we write is not found among the list of those granted in the *Formula maior*, and has been granted in reply to a special request to some of the Bishops of Australia.

(a) The person authorised to permit the celebration of two Masses on a week day is the Ordinary, i.e., the Bishop or the Vicar-General, and the Vicar-Capitular, during the vacancy of the See.[10] As the faculty is delegated by the Holy See, and subject to no prohibition to the contrary, it can be sub-delegated, even habitually.[11] Whether the Ordinary grants to all the priests of his Diocese the habitual faculty to binate on week days (given the required conditions), or whether he reserves to himself to give it only when specially requested, is a matter for himself to determine, having regard to the general good of the faithful—which is the purpose of the concession.

(b) *Dies feriales* in this context are all days other than Sundays and Holidays of Obligation, excluding the days on which the liturgical laws forbid the celebration of Mass.

(c) *Quando necessitas pro bono fidelium occurrat.* As there is no question of an obligation on the faithful to hear Mass on these days, the word *necessitas* must not be taken as equivalent to need for the means to fulfil a law, as would be the case on a Sunday, etc. The English word "necessity" is much more restrictive in its meaning, as it implies something that cannot be done without. Here we may perhaps understand *necessitas* as what is desirable for the good of souls. If a number of people have a genuine wish to hear Mass and *a fortiori* to receive Holy

---

[10]For a complete list of those who come under the name of Ordinary see can. 198.

[11]Can. 199, par. 2.

Communion, there is need or necessity (in this sense) for the Mass. Such need could easily arise in some places on a first Friday, or some special Feast, on the occasion of a Funeral to be attended by a number of people, or a Wedding with a score or so of guests.

The *bonum fidelium,* we think, should be interpreted as the spiritual good of a considerable number of the people (*pars notabilis populi*), i.e., about twenty persons, who have a desire to satisfy their devotion by hearing Mass.

A priest who enjoys this faculty should not hesitate to use it. It is given for the sake of the people, and should be availed of when the conditions are fulfilled. It is not for us to use arbitrarily the concessions granted for the benefit of souls by the Supreme Pastor.

JAMES MADDEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SHORT NOTICE

THE QUEEN OF SEVEN SWORDS, by G. K. Chesterton. Sheed and Ward, London, 1957. 53 pp. 2/6.

This little Pocket Edition contains over twenty of G.K.'s poems which the publishers state are not contained in the collected edition of Chesterton's Poems. These poems were first published in 1926 and reprinted in the small, pocket edition in 1944. It is interesting to see that the present little book is part for the third impression. Such beautiful works as: The Return of Eve, A Party Question, The Ballad of King Arthur and the series to the patrons of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Spain and France, are included in this little book. And after the brutal reading provided by newspapers and their brash reviewers, how refreshing, how noble to read the cool, sinewy English of G.K.C.

T.V.

Canon Law

MARRIAGE CASE CONCERNING SANATIO IN RADICE

Dear Rev. Sir,

I, and several others, would be very grateful for some discussion concerning the following marriage case. The facts, as I have been presented with them, are as follows. John, a Catholic, contracted a valid marriage with Mary, also a Catholic. Unfortunately, the marriage broke up and a civil divorce was obtained. Some time after the divorce John went through a form of marriage in a Registry Office with Anna, a non-Catholic. Some years after this marriage Mary died, and John wished to have his marriage with Anna revalidated in the Church. Anna, however, completely refused to renew consent before a priest. Now, I am interested in the possibility of a Sanatio in Radice for this marriage of John and Anna. When I mentioned this case to a fellow-priest he said that he always understood that in such a case a Sanatio could not be granted. Consequently, I now submit this question: Can a Sanatio in Radice be obtained for the marriage of John and Anna, in the supposition that the usual conditions for the granting of a Sanatio are present?

GRATEFUL.

REPLY

Before we proceed, as requested, to a discussion of the proposed case, it can be stated at the outset that the Church *does not grant* a Sanatio in such a case. The reason may be found in the fact that the supposition proposed by our correspondent is not verified in the case. He writes: "Can a Sanatio in Radice be obtained for the marriage of John and Anna, *in the supposition that the usual conditions for granting a Sanatio are present?*" The fact is, as we shall now proceed to point out, that all the "usual conditions" are not present in the proposed case.

The conditions that are necessary for the granting of a Sanatio in Radice are set down by the legislator in Canon 1139, § I, which states: "Any marriage that is entered into with the consent of both parties which is naturally sufficient but juridically ineffective on account of a diriment impediment of ecclesiastical law or because of the lack of the required form,

can be sanated in radice, provided the consent perseveres." Of course, in accordance with Canon 84, there must also exist a proportionately grave cause for the granting of the dispensation. Now, if we apply these conditions to the marriage case proposed by our correspondent, it will readily be seen that, while most of the required conditions could be present, one of them is certainly lacking. That is: the consent in the case could be naturally valid, it could still be persevering at the time of the application of the Sanatio, and a proportionately grave reason would exist, namely, that the Catholic party would be deprived of the Sacraments unless the marriage is validated by other than the ordinary method.

But one of the requisites as set down in Canon 1139, § I, is not verified in the proposed case. The marriage between John and Anna is not simply a marriage that is invalid on the ground of lack of canonical form. It is a marriage that is invalid because there existed a diriment impediment of the divine law, namely, the impediment of Ligamen or an existing valid marriage. Canon 1139, § I, affirms that a Sanatio in Radice is granted only if there exists a diriment impediment of ecclesiastical law; and thus it is not granted in a case such as that of John and Anna. The second section of Canon 1139 affirms this principle, for it states: "But a marriage that is contracted with an impediment of the natural or divine law, even if the impediment afterwards ceases, the Church does not sanate in radice, not even from the moment of the cessation of the impediment."

If the diriment impediment in our proposed case was one of merely ecclesiastical law the Church could grant a Sanatio, because she can dispense from her own laws. But she has no such power where the divine law is concerned. However, it is interesting to note that Canon 1139 simply states that the Church *does not grant a Sanatio* (*non sanat* in radice) when a diriment impediment of divine law has caused the invalidity of the marriage; and it does not state that the Church *cannot* grant a Sanatio in such a case. In other words, the legislator appears deliberately to have confined himself to a statement of fact and does not touch on the question as to whether the Church *could or could not*. According to the Canon she simply *does not*.

It would appear that the reason for this deliberate phraseology may be found in the distinction between a perfect

and an imperfect Sanatio. A perfect Sanatio is one that produces an effect which is retroactive to the time of the marriage itself; while an imperfect or partial Sanatio is one that produces an effect that is retroactive to the time of the cessation of the impediment. It is clear that there cannot be any question of a perfect Sanatio when the invalidity was caused by a diriment impediment of the divine law. The reason is that, since the Church has not the power to dispense from the divine law, it is also beyond her power, even by a fiction of law, to consider a marriage as valid from the beginning in regard to its canonical effects, when in point of fact an impediment of divine law—over which the Church has no power—existed at the very beginning. For that reason it should be clear that, in the case of John and Anna, not only would the Church not grant a Sanatio with a retroactive effect to the time of the marriage itself, but she *could not do so.*

However, the case is not the same when there is question of the possibility of an imperfect Sanatio. In the case proposed by our correspondent the impediment of Ligamen ceased when Mary, John's first and lawful wife, died. Could not a Sanatio be granted to have retroactive effect at least to the time of Mary's death, since in consequence of her death there is no longer the obstacle of an impediment of divine law? The answer to this question, we believe, really contains the reason for the legislator's use in Canon 1139 of the words *non sanat* rather than *non potest sanare.* For it seems to us that in a case where an impediment of divine law has caused the invalidity of the marriage, an imperfect or partial Sanatio could be granted, which would produce its effect from the time of the cessation of the impediment. In that case, as far as an imperfect Sanatio is concerned, the significance of the phrase *does not sanate* (*non sanat*) in Canon 1139 is not that the Church cannot grant an imperfect Sanatio, but that she does not do so even though it is within her power. As far as the case proposed by our correspondent is concerned, it means that while absolutely speaking the attempted marriage between John and Anna could be sanated from the time of Mary's death, the Church does not exercise this power.

The following brief historical note will perhaps help towards a better appreciation of the doctrine which has been explained above.

In discussions on this point reference is invariably made to

a reply of the Holy Office issued on 2nd March, 1904. The question of which we have been treating had been proposed on several occasions to this Sacred Congregation, and at this period it had been discussed extensively by this Congregation. A difference of opinion prevailed among the authorities, but finally on the above date the Holy Office replied that a marriage contracted with an impediment of the divine or natural law *cannot* be sanated in radice (*non posse sanari in radice*). Gasparri remarks that this declaration embraced both perfect and imperfect sanation; that is, it simply denied to the Church any power to sanate such a marriage.

Many canonists, among them Gasparri himself, did not agree completely with this response of the Holy Office. Hence, Gasparri relates that during the work of the drafting of the Code of Canon Law he pointed out to Pope Pius X that the above reply of the Holy Office should not be incorporated into the Code since it denied to the Church a power which, according to many canonists and theologians, was possessed by the Church; namely, the power to grant an imperfect Sanatio in such a case. The consequence was that Pope Pius X approved the recommendation of the consultors on the work of drafting the Code that the Canon should state that the Church *does not sanate* (*non sanat*) such marriages even from the cessation of the impediment, rather than state that the Church *cannot sanate* (*non potest sanare*) such marriages. Thus it was that Canon 1139, § 2, came into the Code in its present form, in which the legislator confines himself to a question of fact (cfr. Gasparri, P., De Matrimonio, Vol. 2, nn. 1216-1218).

G. C. GALLEN.

St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.

Liturgy

CONSECRATION OF A CHURCH: SEPULCHRE OF ALTAR — CROSSES ON WALLS

Dear Rev. Sir,

I. On examining the altar of a chapel to be consecrated in the near future, it is found that the stonemason has cut the sepulchre completely through the marble *mensa,* though it is a slab nearly three inches thick. The bottom of the slot is certainly closed by a slab of cement on which the *mensa* rests, but is this sufficient for the valid consecration? One author consulted states that if the *mensa* is accidentally perforated when the sepulchre is being cut out, then it suffices to close up the perforation before placing the relics in the sepulchre. However, as in the case in question the hole has been cut completely through the slab, would it be necessary for another sepulchre to be cut in a proper manner, or should a slab of marble be inserted and solidly fixed at the bottom of the existing cavity?

II. Another query concerns the consecration crosses on the walls. All authors state that the crosses must be on natural stone, and that, if the walls are made of brick or plaster, pieces of natural stone must be inserted for the places of anointing. Having recently noticed in a consecrated church that these crosses were merely cut into the cement rendering on the brick walls, is it still necessary to adhere to the common opinion?

CEREMONIARIUS.

REPLY

I. A reply of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (D. 3884) applies to the situation described by our correspondent, and is usually referred to by authors, e.g., *Nabuco,* Pontificalis Romani Expositio, ii § 30; *O'Connell,* Church building and furnishing, p. 143. The Congregation stated that in the circumstances a piece of stone should be fixed at the bottom of the cavity and the reliquary may be placed on this, and the lid of the sepulchre fixed during the rite of consecration. Nabuco adds that it is absolutely necessary for validity that the sepulchre be closed on all sides by stone (l.c.). By making this adjustment it can be said that the relics are truly set in the *mensa* of the altar. The

present incident is a reminder of the care needed in preparing the detail drawings for an altar before sending them on to the stonemasons.

II. In 1909 the Archbishop of Port au Prince (Haiti) asked the Sacred Congregation of Rites whether a church constructed of reinforced concrete might be consecrated according to the rite and form of the Roman Pontifical. The reply was: Yes, provided that the places for the 12 Crosses and the jambs of the main door are stone (D. 4240). Referring to this decree, the commentators generally state that the anointings must be made on natural stone. One writer, however, makes a distinction between a reinforced concrete structure and a church built of another material, such as brick. As the reply of the Congregation refers only to a church built of reinforced concrete, he says, the need for the stone crosses arises only in such a building, although it is desirable that the same rule be followed in all buildings not built of natural stone (cfr. *Ephem. liturg.* 1910, pp. 4-5).

The places of the anointings have to be marked in some permanent fashion and the use of crosses carved in stone would seem to be the most satisfactory way of achieving this. Likewise, although the above Decree states that the jambs of the main door should be of natural stone, commentators generally agree that it suffices if the places where the anointings are made be of natural stone. As to the size of the pieces of stone inserted in the walls, it is suggested that they be at least eight inches square, or the same size in diameter if they are round, and sufficiently thick to ensure that they may be firmly and permanently fixed in the wall.

* * * * *

NUMBER OF CANDLES AT LOW MASS

Dear Rev. Sir,

How many candles should be lit for Low Mass celebrated by a priest?

TITUS.

REPLY

Two candles should be lighted for a Low Mass celebrated by a priest, but for some special reason more candles may be lighted. For example, on more solemn feasts or for some special solemnity it is permissible to use more than two candles for a parochial Mass or the Community Mass of a religious community (cfr.

S.R.C. 3059. ix). How many candles should be lighted, four or six? Perhaps we may work backwards in this way—six lighted candles are normally required for a High Mass, four for a *Missa cantata,* therefore, at a Low Mass, the six lighted candles should be reserved for the very solemn feasts or celebrations, and four candles for feasts of lesser rank. It would seem in order to have four lighted candles for the public Masses in a church on Sunday.

The discreet use of flowers and candles on the altar is an important factor in creating an atmosphere of solemnity in a church. When flowers and candles are used indiscriminately every day, be it feria, simple or double, there is not the same opportunity of indicating the more solemn rank of the higher feasts when they occur.

* * * * *

THE RITE OF MARRIAGE

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you kindly describe the Marriage ceremony between Catholics as visualized by the *Collectio Rituum*?

SENEX.

REPLY

The Church has always allowed rather more liberty in the celebration of Marriages than in the rites of the other Sacraments, because of the variety of long-standing local customs. The general use of the Baltimore Ritual, which follows closely the Roman Ritual, has ensured more uniformity in this country, but the rite for Marriage contained in the *Collectio Rituum* is somewhat different. Where the Local Ordinary has determined the rite to be followed, his instructions must be observed, since it is his duty to regulate the forms of public worship and insist upon the observance of the Church's laws.

Keeping in mind these provisions, we may consider the rite of the *Collectio Rituum.*

PREPARATIONS

If the Marriage takes place before a Nuptial Mass, and the priest who assists at the Marriage is also the celebrant of the Mass, he vests as for Mass except for the maniple, which is left at the credence. If the Marriage is celebrated without Nuptial Mass, or if the Mass is celebrated by another priest, the priest assisting at

the Marriage vests in surplice, white stole and white cope. We may note here that the cope is not prescribed by the Roman Ritual or by the Baltimore.

The Holy Water container and sprinkler, the Ritual, the dish on which the rings will be placed, together with the surplices for the servers must be prepared. The Roman Ritual says that there should be at least one server present. The above are prepared, according to the rubric, *ad altare.* This cannot mean on the altar, but on a table arranged in a convenient place; the vestments for the servers would be prepared in the sacristy.

Ante altare two kneelers and chairs are prepared for the bride and bridegroom. Despite the objections of some writers, there is a generally established custom in most parts of this country, and apparently in other places too, that the bridal couple may take their places in the sanctuary during the Nuptial Mass. The place they occupy for the actual Marriage rite may vary. Local custom or regulation may determine that the Marriage should take place at the altar rails. Martinucci, for example, directs the celebrant to stand on the footpace, and the bride and bridegroom to kneel on the edge of the footpace, or on the top step. This arrangement does not appear to be very convenient when the much longer rite of the *Collectio Rituum* is being used, and when bridal trains have to be considered. All in all, the altar rails, or in a church with a larger sanctuary—two kneelers in the centre of the sanctuary, would seem to be the most satisfactory place for the Marriage ceremony, both from the viewpoint of the rubrics and the normal convenience of the parties.

THE CEREMONY

When the bridal party has taken up its position, all kneel, and the priest stands facing the altar and says: *Adiutorium nostrum,* &c., together with the prayer. These may be recited in English.

The rubric after the prayer reads: *Si habendus sit sermo, nunc fiat. Cuius locum haberi potest EXHORTATIO.* The rubric following the Exhortation is: *Deinde stent omnes, etiam Sponsi.* The question arises, should the bridal party stand or kneel for the Exhortation? Since the Exhortation is a substitute for the sermon, and since we normally stand or sit for a sermon, it seems reasonable that the bride and bridegroom should stand or sit for

the Exhortation. Further, since the Exhortation is substituted for a sermon, it would also seem permissible to replace it by another selection.

The priest questions the two parties regarding their consent to the Marriage. He then instructs them to join their right hands, places the end of the stole around their hand if he can conveniently do so, and has each repeat after him the formula: *I NN. take you,* &c., The priest pronounces them man and wife with the words *Ego coniungo vos,* which must be said in Latin, and may be repeated in English. He continues: *I call upon all of you here present to be witnesses,* &c., and sprinkles the couple with holy water.

The blessing of the ring or rings follows. The introductory versicles and responses may be said in English, but the prayer must be recited in Latin (and repeated in English, if one wishes), using the singular or plural form as required. After the prayer he sprinkles the ring with holy water.

The bridegroom places the ring on the finger of the bride while repeating the form after the priest. The same procedure is followed by the bride if a second ring is used.

One of the newer features of the Marriage rite of the *Collectio Rituum* is the final blessing, made up of Psalm 127, some versicles and responses, the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus,* and a five-fold blessing, all of which may be recited in English. The five-fold blessing originated in the West Gothic Liturgy of Spain, from which it was adopted by the Diocese of Trier, and subsequently incorporated into the German *Collectio Rituum.* The American ritual borrowed it from the German (cfr. *The Furrow,* 1957, p. 664).

If the Nuptial Mass follows the Marriage, the blessing is given as set down, i.e., Psalm 127, the versicles, the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus,* and the five-fold blessing, this last being recited with the hands extended over the bride and bridegroom.

But the rubric which determines the procedure to be followed when the Nuptial Mass is not celebrated is not devoid of a certain obscurity. Rubric n. 10 says: If the marriage is not to be blessed, the priest having recited Psalm 127 with the versicles, as noted above n. 7, says the following prayer only: *Praetende.* What is the meaning of the words: *If the Marriage is not to be*

blessed. Father J. Danagher, C.M., whose articles in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* indicate that he is thoroughly familiar with the background of the *Collectio,* comments on this rubric. "In the rubrics, No. 10 gives a prayer to be recited if the marriage is not to be blessed. The blessing given in the course of the marriage ceremony is not the nuptial blessing. However, the rubric just referred to indicates that even this blessing is to be omitted, and a concluding prayer substituted for it, if the nuptial blessing does not follow the marriage. Of course, the nuptial blessing is usually given during Mass, although by reason of apostolic indult it is sometimes permitted outside of Mass. Therefore, the proper understanding of the rubric seems to be this.

"If the nuptial blessing is going to be conferred, either during Mass or outside of Mass the priest should also recite the vernacular blessing found under No. 8 in the marriage ceremony. If the nuptial blessing is not to be given, the blessing in the ceremony should also be omitted, and the final prayer found in No. 10 is to be recited in its stead" [*Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* LVI (1955), pp. 21-22].

The Apostolic Indult mentioned as necessary for the giving of the Nuptial Blessing outside Mass has been granted to the Australian Bishops (Formula Maior n. 28) and in a number of dioceses the faculty has been included in the ordinary faculties given to priests. But even in such cases, the blessing may be given, always with the special form prescribed by the Roman Ritual (t. viii. c. iii), only to those who may receive the blessing during a Nuptial Mass, i.e., it cannot be given to a bride who has already received the blessing in a previous marriage, nor may it be given during the *tempus clausum,* except with permission of the Ordinary who may grant permission as for a Nuptial Mass during the same times.

In practice, therefore, if the bride has already received the blessing, or if the priest assisting at the marriage has not the faculty to confer the blessing outside Mass, at any time or within the *tempus clausum,* the final part of the marriage rite will be Psalm 127, the versicles and the prayer *Praetende* only (n. 10).

On the other hand, if the priest can give the Nuptial Blessing outside Mass, even during the *tempus clausum* with permission, then it would seem that he may recite the whole

of the final blessing as found in the *Collectio Rituum*, i.e., Psalm 127, versicles, prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus*, and the five-fold blessing (nn. 7 and 8). Must he also give the Nuptial Blessing outside Mass according to the formula contained in the *Rituale Romanum?* It would seem that this is not necessary, even though Father Danagher's words, quoted above, might indicate the opposite view. Against this interpretation is the fact that to do so would involve the incongruous repetition of Psalm 127 and versicles. Moreover, just as the psalm, versicles and prayer of the *Collectio* used when the blessing is not given correspond to the formula of the Roman Ritual; Preces recitandae extra Missam super coniuges quando benedictio nuptialis non permittitur, it seems reasonable to conclude that the blessing of the *Collectio* (nn. 7 and 8) may take the place of the formula for the Nuptial Blessing outside Mass. Hence whenever this latter may be given, the full blessing of the *Collectio* may likewise be given. An interpretation by the competent authority may resolve the doubt.

To summarize, the blessing at the conclusion of the rite will be arranged as follows:

MARRIAGE WITH NUPTIAL MASS:

Psalm 127, versicles, prayer, five-fold blessing, Mass.

MARRIAGE WITHOUT NUPTIAL MASS:

A. If blessing may be given: Psalm 127, versicles, prayer, five-fold blessing.

B. If blessing may not be given (widow previously blessed, *tempus clausum*): Psalm 127, versicles, prayer: *Praetende.*

NUPTIAL MASS

The prayers of the Nuptial Blessing recited after the *Pater noster* and before the Last Blessing may be said in English, since the translation is printed alongside the Latin text. The rubric prescribes that the bride and bridegroom should kneel *ante altare*, but if they are already present on the sanctuary, the convenience of the bride would be sufficient reason for their remaining at their kneelers instead of coming to the foot of the altar. After the final prayer, the celebrant sprinkles the couple with holy water.

THE SINGING OF THE *BENEDICTUS*

Several overseas reviews have carried a report regarding the singing of the *Benedictus* before the Consecration. It is stated that the Sacred Congregation of Rites does not insist on previous decisions which prescribe that the *Benedictus* should be sung after the Consecration. As the matter is not of sufficient moment to warrant a new decree, none will be forthcoming, but the practice is not to be condemned. The uniting of the two chants is, of course, simply a reversion to the original order which was altered to take account of the too lengthy polyphonic compositions. The same difficulty does not arise with the use of the Gregorian melodies. Some may wonder whether it is permissible to have a Eucharistic motet sung after the Consecration in place of the *Benedictus*. It is permissible but not recommended, as the Canon of the Roman Mass is recited in silence, and silence should be the characteristic of this part of the Mass. Recent Episcopal directives for the Mass generally place a great deal of emphasis on silence during the Canon. A final observation may be borrowed from the Directory issued by Cardinal van Roey for the Archdiocese of Malines: when the melody of the *Sanctus-Benedictus* chant is simple, it is desirable that the celebrant should not begin the *Te igitur* until the chant has been finished.

P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Homiletics

CHRIST, OUR TEACHER

The most striking feature of St. Matthew's gospel is the prominence given to Our Lord's teaching. The evangelist reports five "formal" sermons of Christ, which between them occupy nine full chapters of the gospel, and large sections of many other chapters are composed of His words. In all, considerably more than half of the work is taken up by His preaching. In the light of this first impression, it is interesting to read separately some of the sections of the gospel between the discourses, such as Chapters 8-9. The impression once again is that St. Matthew has built his gospel around the discourses; they are the substance of his message around which he has grouped such accounts of the infancy, the miracles and the passion, as were necessary to complete the story.

This, perhaps, is just the contrary to what we might have expected in the first written gospel. A factual account of Our Lord's life and miracles might have been expected before a didactic piece such as St. Matthew has left us. The problem disappears, however, when we recall that this gospel was written for converts from Judaism. In terms of religious knowledge these people were far ahead of the converted pagans for whom Mark and Luke wrote. They had been educated on the Law and the Prophets. The picture of Christ as a wandering preacher, gathering the crowds around Him on the Mount or by the Lake of Galilee, fitted perfectly into their prophetic world. To people for whom religion had meant the scribes commenting upon the Old Testament in the synagogues, sabbath by sabbath, it was not merely reasonable, but necessary, to expect a teaching Messiah.

St. Matthew, therefore, has presented to them Christ the Teacher. We are told that, from the outset of His public career, He "went about the whole of Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom" (4:23); and His last injunctions to the apostles began with: "Going, teach all nations" (28:19). The different stages of the public life are marked by the changing tone and contents of the discourses: there is the early optimism of the Sermon on the Mount, as the

hearers admire the direct and simple character of His message; there come the warnings of persecution as He sends the apostles in His name (Ch. 10); in Ch. 12 there is open conflict with the pharisees over the incident of plucking the ears of wheat; as a result, there follows the caution and the obscurity (for most) of the parables (Ch. 13); there is the period of private instruction of the apostles (Ch. 18); then He returns for the final conflict with the pharisees (Ch. 23) and the terrifying predictions about the punishment of Jerusalem (Ch. 24-25). It is by following the Divine Teacher through all these stages that we begin to see and understand His character as Matthew did, and as he intended his first readers to do. What follows is an attempt to single out a few of the principal features of that character.

The first point to be noted is that His preaching is motivated by a deep love for His hearers. As a rule, we are more accustomed to associate the compassion of Christ with St. Luke. Yet more than once in the first gospel it is evident that the Divine Teacher is inspired by compassion for a spiritually famished people. "And seeing the multitudes He was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and prostrate, like sheep without a shepherd" (9:36). The same motive is behind all His activities: "And on landing he saw a great crowd, and he was moved with compassion towards them and healed their sick" (14:14). He feels for His people as He would feel for a mother, brother or sister: "And stretching forth His hand towards his disciples he said: 'Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever doth the will of my Father who is in the heavens, he is my brother and sister and mother'" (12:48-50). The disciples, too, when they preach in His name, are to show a similar devotion to the flock: "Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out the devils; freely have you received, freely give" (10:8). As the story moves on we see rejection by His people looming up before Him. Yet, even in the hostile atmosphere of the last days, He reserves His bitterness for the pharisees; for the sake of the people, He is sad. The parables of the vineyard and the marriage feast point not only to His rejection but to His love under rejection. Again, His final word on the subject is one of sadness rather than resentment: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that slayest the prophets and stonest those that are sent to thee, how often would I have gathered

together thy children, as the hen gathereth her nestlings under her wings, and ye would not" (23:37).

Compassion was the first mark of the Teacher, simplicity the first mark of the teaching. He must have appealed to His hearers by His very simplicity. For example, in the Sermon on the Mount He completely dispelled the idea that wisdom, eloquence, or any other type of sophistication was necessary in order to approach God. In one word He swept away all the complicated circumlocutions invented by pharisaic scrupulosity for addressing God: "Pray ye therefore thus: Our Father . . ." (6:9). At a time when God had been hidden away behind an insurmountable barrier of legal restrictions, there must have been something extremely refreshing about the simple logic of this: "Ask and it shall be given to you. . . . What man of you is there, whose son shall ask of him a loaf, and he will hand him a stone?" (7:7-8). This direct approach to the Father was disarming in its simplicity, especially to the ears of a pharisaic world of ritual formalities. The people to whom He spoke were, on the whole, subject to many hardships: yet, even here, there was no answer to His simple logic: "Consider the lilies of the field . . . look ye at the birds of the air" (6:26-28). It is no wonder that, as Matthew informs us, the people at once contrasted His teaching with that of the scribes and pharisees. For they recognised in His word the plan of a clear and direct path to the Father.

If the simplicity of Christ's teaching was heartily welcomed, its second quality was less acceptable. The aristocrats of Judea, in particular, were not prepared for the depth of sincerity demanded by Our Lord. In an atmosphere of legal observance, such as had been fostered by the pharisees, it was reasonably easy to evade uncomfortable obligations. To accept this new Teacher was to end all that. Now it was a matter of fasting and praying in secret where only the Father could observe, a practice which carried very little human consolation (6:17). The Law, strict as it may have been, announced both the extent and the limit of one's obligation; but now that a new spiritual interpretation had been given ("But I say to you") where was the limit to be drawn? To be called to perfection such as that of the heavenly Father involved some misgivings (5:48). That the external ritual was not of decisive importance, was clear from such words as: "Leave there the gift before the altar, and

go first and be reconciled with thy brother" (5:23-25). "If ye forgive not men their transgressions, neither will the Father forgive you your transgressions" (6:15). Here indeed was food for thought. Our Lord was clearly demanding a depth of sincerity quite alien to the pharisees. On the one hand, of course, He tore down the edifice of legalism which had cluttered up the service of God; but now, in its place, there was a spiritual structure which promised to be far more exacting. And, dominating the scene, as the hearers endeavoured to choose between the two, there was the compelling sincerity of the Teacher Himself. As time went on it became increasingly clear that the old bottles would never take the new wine, that the old patch would never do. The only question was: were they ready for the new Kingdom which was among them?

Compassion, simplicity, sincerity: yet it is doubtful whether these qualities alone would have brought about His rejection. There is another feature which must be added. It may be termed the decisive authority which marked all His preaching. He called for a complete change of heart, as is implicit in His "Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand" (4:17). In this new Kingdom, conformity to the old forms of the past will not be adequate: "Unless your justice abound more than that of the scribes and the pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of the heavens" (5:20). His spiritual interpretation of "Thou shalt not kill" was more than an invitation: "Whosoever saith 'Thou fool' shall be liable to the hell of fire" (5:22). Where sin is concerned He knows no compromise: "If thy right eye scandalize thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and thy whole body be not cast into hell" (5:29). At times this tone of severity becomes almost threatening: "Enter ye by the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad the way that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter thereby" (7:13). Sincerity is to be tested by deeds rather than by cry of "Lord, Lord" (7:20). And should one fail? "Every tree that doth not bring forth fruit is cut down and cast into the fire" (7:19). It was this tone of authoritative finality that surprised His hearers most, and won Him most enemies. He concludes the Sermon on the Mount by claiming an authority scarcely less than divine: His word is the height of wisdom (the house built on rock); to reject it is the extreme of folly (the house on sand) 7:24-26.

This more forceful side of Christ's character is well shown by the stark terms in which He places His message before His audience. The possibility of damnation is ever recurring in His words: the word "hell" is used no less than nine times in the gospel, as compared with three times each in Mark and Luke, while on six occasions we come across the vivid "weeping and gnashing of teeth." He will not hide the fact that coming after Him means taking up the cross, losing one's life in order to save it: "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul? Or what shall a man give as a price for his soul" (16:24-26). He has a habit of summarizing the eternal truths in a few blunt and striking words: "You cannot serve God and mammon" (6:24); "Think not that I have come to cast peace on the earth; I have come not to cast peace, but a sword" (10:34). This is the language of a strong, realistic, practical character who knows no compromise with sin.

This feature of the Divine Teacher is shown even more clearly by His treatment of His adversaries. His contest with the pharisees is a theme which Matthew has developed to the full. These, we must recall, were the former masters of his readers. Their prestige was great, and no doubt their eloquence was at least equal to that of Christian teachers at this stage. More than one early convert may have felt inclined to return to the traditional fold. Matthew, therefore, made a point of portraying the defects of pharisaism as clearly as possible—a task for which, as a former publican, he may have felt even some natural relish. The contest between the new Kingdom and the pharisees begins from the preaching of John: "Brood of vipers, who hath shewn you how to flee from the wrath that is to come?" (3:7). It reaches its climax in the condemnations of Ch. 23: "Woe to you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites . . . blind guides . . . like unto whitened sepulchres." This chapter contains the most bitter recorded words of Our Lord and well illustrates His vigorous reaction to whatever stood in the way of His mission.

As He approaches His passion He is not portrayed as sinking into submission. There is a tone of sadness in His last discourse over Jerusalem, but yet His words are forthright and terrifying. He is a royal figure entering the city on the day of palms. Matthew gives a fine account of His verbal triumphs of the last days, when He confounded all by His answers and questions.

Finally, at the moment of His condemnation, He still speaks to the Sanhedrin of the power with which He will come on the clouds of heaven (26:64). It is in a literary context of power and victory, rather than of defeat, that the crucifixion is enacted: "And behold, the curtain of the sanctuary was rent in twain from top to bottom, and the earth quaked, and the rocks were rent, and the tombs were opened" (27:51). "And when the centurion and those with him on guard over Jesus saw the earthquake and all that befell, they were very much afraid, and they said, 'Truly he was the Son of God'" (27:54).

This aspect of power, authority and strength, completes the more kindly features mentioned above. In conclusion, it is interesting to observe how these same features were impressed by Christ upon the Church which was to take His place after the Ascension. Just as the teaching role of Our Lord received prominence in this gospel, so did the teaching role of the apostles. It is the person who "shall do and teach" that shall be called great in the Kingdom (5:19). The apostles must be "scribes instructed in the kingdom of the heavens," bringing forth from their store new things and old (13:52). They are sent out on a teaching mission (Ch. 10), and the last words of the gospel inaugurate their universal mission: "Going, teach all nations" (28:18). Moreover, it is not difficult to see that they are called upon to show the same qualities which we have seen in Christ, the Teacher. They are to be "wise as serpents and simple as doves," to have the gentleness of lambs among ravening wolves (10:16). With the gentleness of Christ they must receive little children as if receiving Him (18:5). Their mission, too, has its severe side: ". . . they shall deliver you up to councils, and shall scourge you in their synagogues . . . a disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord" (10:17-25). Authority is theirs. Even apart from the famous passages on Peter (16:16) and the other apostles (18:18), there can be no doubt about their future authority: it will be "more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for the town" which does not receive them (10:15); while he who "receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me" (10:40). It is in virtue of the universal power given to Him in heaven and on earth that He sends them to teach all nations (28:18).

This, too, was important for Matthew's readers. By becoming Christ's followers they had broken many ties and long traditions. The world at that time knew of no bonds closer than those uniting the Jewish people. It was important that, after leaving all that behind, they should be conscious of their membership in the New Israel, the Kingdom of Heaven. Not only had Christ preached a new message; He had also left behind Him on earth a new society, membership of which entailed that God was still their God and they were still His people.

B. HEATHER,

St. Columba's College,
Springwood, N.S.W.

SHORT NOTICE

THE MOTHER OF THE LITTLE FLOWER. Translated by M. Collins. Gill, Dublin, 1957. 123 pp. 6/-.

On a hill outside Lisieux the parents of the Little Flower rest in the cemetery. One visitor at least found the simplicity of their grave a pleasing contrast to the somewhat garish decorations that had been raised in the town. This story of Mme. Martin is told by her daughter, a nun of the Carmel at Lisieux. The spate of books on the little Saint of Lisieux shows no sign of growing less, as an elegant pen in the A.C.R. has constantly to deal with a bundle. The mother of the Little Flower was born in 1831 near Alencon where her father, a veteran of Napoleon's armies, was a policeman. After some ideas of the religious life, the pious Mlle. Guerin married Louis Martin, the son of a retired army captain, who was a watchmaker. They were married just a hundred years ago, July, 1858. It is most interesting to read of the family life of a French family in the last century. Francois Mauriac is always haunted by the memory of the quiet, provincial towns with their shuttered windows. Here, in this little book, we contemplate the peaceful life of a dignified, laborious, poor family, ever keeping the Sunday (Mme. Martin refused even to take the train on a Sunday), with immense respect for the Church, priests and, as was fitting for a daughter of a soldier, admiration for the army. It was the quiet setting for the development of Christian charity.

T.V.

Notes

PROBLEMS ABOUT PROBLEMS

In most cases, the history of a science is a matter of mere footnotes to the current theories. In philosophy, on the contrary, the history of the subject is the very stuff of philosophical discussion. As the irreverent would have it, philosophers are occupied principally with taking in each other's washing. That this is both inevitable and fruitful is not very difficult to see. One of the prime sources of disagreement among philosophers is that they state their problems in quite different terms. Before attempting to discuss what a philosopher has said on such subjects as the nature of human knowledge or the existence of God it is indispensable to have some understanding of how and why these subjects presented a problem to him. It is more than likely that, if you disagree with a philosopher, you will find yourself forced to claim that his answer is wrong because the question he is attempting to answer is loaded with arbitrary or unsuspected assumptions. For example, the question, "How can we get from our personal awareness of sense-impressions of colours, sounds, smells and pains to knowledge of the external things that cause these impressions in us?" clearly supposes that we are not, as we usually assume, in direct contact through knowledge with things like chairs and trees and other men, but that we merely postulate their existence, in order to explain our sense-impressions, or perhaps believe in them on mere instinct. Unfortunately, it is rarely sufficient to point out to one's opponent that he has put the question in an unusual way. He will probably claim that there are very good reasons for stating the problem in these particular terms. In the case we have just mentioned, he would claim that the well known facts of sense illusions clearly show that there is no infallible correspondence between what we see and feel and what things really are. Before we can make any advance we must settle the question, where does the problem lie?

This is the difficult and important kind of inquiry that Father Hawkins has attempted in his latest book,[1] which is an attempt to

---

[1]Crucial Problems of Modern Philosophy, by D. J. B. Hawkins. 150pp. Sheed and Ward, London. Price, 10s. 6d. stg.

disentangle the real problems from the pseudo-problems in the thought of some typical philosophers from Descartes to the present day. The result is a book that is as tantalising as it is interesting, at once full of sound suggestions and bristling with questionable statements. An appraisal of what Father Hawkins has to say would necessarily make a much larger and duller book than the lively little essay that he has given us. It may, however, be appropriate in these pages to offer some rather general comments on his main theses.

Father Hawkins's main quarrel with the modern philosophers is that they have all taken a too restricted range of experience as their basic datum. Descartes, instead of taking as his starting point a disembodied self engaged in pure thinking, should have kept closer to experience and the embodied self, which is aware of a wide range of sensations. The British Empiricists minced and desiccated human experience, leaving no basis for an understanding of relations between thinking and experience. Kant failed to bridge the gap precisely because he accepted the empiricist analysis of sense knowledge. Contemporary British philosophers still fail to provide an adequate analysis of human experience, with the result that they are forced to despair of constructive philosophical thinking. All of this is, I think, true and important. Clearly, any philosohpy that begins by misdescribing human experience will necessarily fail to provide a plausible theory of knowledge. What remains a mystery is that three centuries of philosophising should have been so utterly perverse. Of course, some excuses can be made for these intellectual delinquents. Those villainous parents, the late medieval scholastics, gave them a lot of bad example, and the environment in which they grew up was all against them. Father Hawkins pleads for benign interpretations at every turn, till we begin to wonder whether there is not more charity than accuracy in his treatment of many points.

If Father Hawkins conveys this impression, which is clearly contrary to his intentions, it is, I think, because he has failed to bring out the central and fundamental problem of modern philosophy, the problem of method. From the day on which Descartes published his *Discourse on Method* down to the present time this problem has been the very core of all philosophical thinking. The first preoccupation of all the major philosophers has been, and to a large extent still is, to develop a method, by

which, as Descartes explains in his *Regulae ad directionem ingenii*, "I mean those simple and certain rules, which, if observed faithfully, will have the result that nobody will ever mistake a falsehood for a truth, and that anybody at all will, by a gradual and continuous growth, arrive at a genuine knowledge of everything he is capable of knowing." The Rationalists sought this elusive Holy Grail in the analysis of "clear and distinct ideas," the Empiricists in the analysis of sense experience, the Kantians in the analysis of presuppositions of human knowledge, while the Hegelians and Marxists found their answer in dialectical thinking; and so on, down to our contemporaries who march under the banner of the method of Linguistic Analysis. A mere glance at the title pages of the classics of modern philosophy will provide striking evidence of this thesis. I think it is no exaggeration to say that there can be no fruitful discussion with modern philosophers unless the problem of philosophical method is put at the head of the agenda.

To these contentions Father Hawkins would almost certainly reply that he does not believe that there is such a thing as *the* method for philosophy, at least in the sense we have been discussing. Reluctantly, I am forced to agree. The Holy Grail of modern philosophy is a myth, and the devoted knights who have sought it so persistently have, for the most part, been wasting their time, following paths that lead only into the desert, with its illusions and disillusionment. What the philosopher seeks is not science but wisdom, which cannot be achieved by techniques, however sophisticated. In philosophy there are no "simple and certain rules" of investigation; there is only that temper of mind that Newman called "the imperial intellect," which strives to give each method, each problem and each approach to the problem its due place in investigation, and each argument and each analogy its due weight in arriving at an answer.

Wisdom is gained only by experience thoroughly digested. The history of philosophy is the sum of human experience in speculative thinking. We must be grateful to Father Hawkins for the many things in this book that will help us remedy what are politely termed digestive disorders.

JOHN BURNHEIM.

St. Columba's College,
Springwood, N.S.W.

THE BEGINNINGS OF DIPLOMACY

Diplomacy and diplomats, it must be said, are regarded with suspicion. Recently a French newspaper printed two illustrations, the first, the meeting of the diplomats at the Congress of Berlin in 1878; the second, a meeting in Paris of the United Nations, the high representatives sitting in perfect order around a semi-circular table with identical writing pads before every statesman. At Berlin, Bismarck, Disraeli and the Russian star, Gortchakoff, sat in careless, aristocratic disorder. The Congress of Berlin, under the guidance of the formidable Prince von Bismarck, accomplished something; but only later shall we know what was done at Paris a few months ago. Kaunitz, Castlereagh, Talleyrand, Metternich, Chateaubriand, Cambon, Bunsen, Isvolksy, Paleologue, Consalvi, Holstein—now there are the names of the historic exponents of the art. Talleyrand, at the Congress of Vienna, was superb in his insolent conduct of affairs. As a former Minister of Foreign Affairs under Napoleon, it was assumed he would feel his position; the Prince de Talleyrand, however, had been so many things in his lifetime that he had long lost any sense of shame and was now the zealous ambassador of his Christian majesty, Louis XVIII, with fine disdain for Bonaparte. He was soon sitting at the table of the Great Powers as an equal.[1] Diplomacy is the art of conducting international relations. Diplomacy in the modern sense of the word dates from the Renaissance, when the national States became strongly organized. From the earliest times rulers had need of a representative to put forward their political views in foreign States. Thus began the race of orators, legates and heralds. Neither in ancient times nor in the Middle Ages had these representatives a permanent status. It is agreed that it was the Republic of Saint Mark which conceived and realized the idea of permanent diplomatic agents residing at foreign courts. What were their duties? Bernardo Navagero, one of Venice's most able diplomats, considered an ambassador should listen with diligence to all that was said by prominent people (and for this reason a Journal was kept in the embassy in which rumours, gossip,

[1]Good judges think, however, in spite of Talleyrand's brilliant conduct, that either Castlereagh or Consalvi (the Papal diplomat) should be considered the real victors at the Congress of Vienna. Consalvi with no force behind him did tremendous things for the Church. In face of opposition, he was able to have the States of the Church restored (saving Avignon), and, at the time, it was a vital matter for the Papal prestige.

reports from *amis* (as the French diplomatists elegantly styled paid spies), of course the discretion of the ambassador was called on here to cull truth from falsehood); secondly, an ambassador had to negotiate, where he was required to display dexterity; thirdly, with objectivity, an ambassador should inform Venice of all that was true and important in the political, social and economic life of the country to which he had been sent. The ambassador had to be a man of distinction who would be an advertisement of his country's prestige and civilization. Under the *Ancien Regime* (i.e., prior to 1789) the French diplomatic agents were a powerful force in propagating French ideas amid the various peoples, where their mission was; yet very often the reward for a perilous mission, say, to the Russia of Peter the Great, was a nod from Louis XIV, or, the Order of Saint Louis.

The immunity of the diplomat's person was assured in a permanent fashion from the 17th century, following upon the publication of the great work by the jurist, Grotius. When an ambassador left for his mission, he was given his credentials to be delivered to the ruler of the State to which he was named. These letters are of little interest to the historian, as, naturally, they contain only generalities. Once arrived (and the Venetian and Pontifical diplomacy worried greatly over the long voyages that their representatives seemed to make at Venice's and Rome's expense) the ambassador met his predecessor who gave him information of current affairs, and above all, the secret list of the *amis,* the spies; next, while waiting for the public audience, which would inaugurate his mission, the ambassador read and re-read the General Instruction that had been given to him in person before he left his own country. This was a secret document in which the designs and policy of the Government which had sent the ambassador are revealed. For instance, the secret instructions of the Spanish ambassador to Urban VIII (1623-1644) are characteristic. The ambassador is reminded of the cosmopolitan nature of the Court of Rome. Italians hate Spain; the French, Spain's enemies, occupy themselves with the study of the noble arts; Austrians are more enemies than friends; the courtiers from Lorraine, Flanders and Liege are generally mere clerks, hence can be ignored. The Pope was to be approached with reverence, but the ambassador was always to realize that the Pope needed Spain's help more than Spain needed the Pope's. Spanish arguments were to be pressed, but it

was useless to persist when there was evident opposition, as in all quarrels the Pope was supreme judge. The ambassador was to pay all respect to the Cardinals, realizing, however, that under Urban VIII only the Cardinal-nephew counted in political affairs. The General Instruction continues to give very practical advice, particularly in the case of a sudden conclave.[2] The ambassador now sought the official audience, usually an affair of roses, though the alert diplomat was to note any signs of approaching demise on the face and figure of his illustrious host[3]. Sometimes even an audience was a trial of a man's courage and composure. The Venetian, Vincenzo Gradenigo, in 1599, having lost 18 of his suite through illness, reached Constantinople. The day of his audience with the Sultan came. After a series of extraordinary happenings, the Venetian arrived at the entrance to the Sultan's apartments when he was gripped by two eunuchs and half-carried into the Sultan's presence. The Sultan was found to be reclining on a divan which was covered with silk trappings, adorned with pearls. The Sultan remained motionless with his eyes fixed on the rich Persian carpets. From a great distance, the Venetian muttered the terms of his credentials, which the Sultan in a low tone acknowledged in one word. The two eunuchs immediately carried the Venetian from the presence. Every business has its difficult moments. Consalvi showed the true diplomatic touch when the young General Bonaparte, angered during the negotiations for the Concordat, noticing among his dinner guests Consalvi, asked him when he was going back to Rome. After dinner, General, the Papal diplomat coolly replied, winning Bonaparte's instant admiration. The ambassador, with the audience over, at once began to write what the Venetians called *dispacci diplomatici*—the dispatches to his own Government. Naturally the Court to which he had been sent was interested in the impressions and views of the ambassador. To learn these was the duty of the *Cabinet Noir*—i.e., the postal

---

[2]It will be understood that the secret General Instructions are of the utmost value in historical studies, as they give the real mind of the Government in question.

[3]The Venetians excelled in their portraits. Queen Mary of England is described as of smallish stature, her complexion "white carnation specked with red." She was very thin, with large grey eyes. Her face was round and her hair was auburn. Her nose was "perhaps rather squat and large." The Venetian ends judiciously, "one would call her beautiful rather than ugly, if she were not approaching, by the advance of years, her decline." Most interesting, too, are their descriptions of their reception by Charles V, and the quiet, almost menacing, audience given by Philip II, his son.

officials whose duty it was to open all dispatches coming from the diplomats, resealing the letters perfectly after making a copy of the contents. The *Cabinet Noir* at Vienna under Kaunitz reached the highest degree in the art.[4] The diplomats then turned to secret writing, using code-words, invisible ink, finally the cipher, where numbers replaced letters. The system of the *grille* was a further development of the cipher, being a piece of a paper with a cutting, for instance, on the left-side, so that only the ciphers seen through the cutting were of value.

An ambassador had two ciphers, one to correspond with his country's ambassadors in the various Courts, while the other was proper to him for his correspondence with the Foreign Minister of his own country. On August 29, 1553, the Papal diplomat, Dandino, wrote to the Secretary of State from the Court of Charles V *en clair,* saying that the Emperor in perfect health was about to rejoin his army. At the same time, Dandino sent in cipher the news that Charles V had not been able to leave his rooms owing to ill-health for seven months. Experts raise up counter-experts and very quickly the most abstruse ciphers were broken. William the Silent's supporter, Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde, was a pastmaster in the business. The one remedy was to change the cipher at regular periods.[5] Who carried the dispatches? In the Middle Ages, wandering monks and scholars were pressed into service, but at the time of the Renaissance, the great merchants of Italy and Germany, the Medicis and the Fuggers, combined with the diplomats in the organisation of the modern postal service, which was developed by the Italian family, Tassis, who controlled the Belgian postal service until 1794, and the German posts until the 19th century, where the family had settled and changed their name to Von

---

[4]Kaunitz, Chancellor of Austria (1753-1794), saw to it that the *Cabinet Noir* was active at the relay stations of the postal service, especially at Eisenach, Francfurt, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ratisbon and in the Hanseatic towns, as also in Mayence. Private dispatch riders were bought or kidnapped.

[5]Treatises were written by retired breakers of ciphers, pointing out that vowels are used more than other letters; among them E is the most frequent, so that if a number is used frequently it can be assumed to be E. So that if you had a group of three numbers in which E is identified as the first then the word may be *eut, eau, eux,* but probably is *est.* Two identical numbers at the end of a word likewise betray the presence of E, i.e., *armee,* and so on. Some experts thought lemon juice was excellent for a few important lines, as the cipher at once arouses suspicion.

Thurm und Taxis.[6] Likewise, the merchants and the diplomats instituted the newspaper. As a Fugger agent left London he was given a paper informing the head office of the weather in London, the plans of the King, the current prices. At Amsterdam, lines on the situation in the Low Countries were added, and so on, until the gossip and information were read in Augsburg.[7]

After some years of faithful and honourable service for his country and for the cause of peace, the time came for the ambassador to take his leave of the Court to which he had been accredited.[8] The process of the first audience was now repeated in reverse. A genial practice was for the Court to give the retiring ambassador a rich gift. The Venetians soon frowned on this somewhat dangerous, though pleasant, custom.[9] The ambassador, while awaiting his successor, began to write his Final Relation, a description of the leading figures in the political life of the country he was leaving, the state of the country looked at from all angles. These documents are a mine

---

[6]The postal services of the Roman Empire fell into disuse in the Middle Ages, as few could write. The headquarters of the Thurm und Taxis family were at Augsburg. Their riders took 36 hours to carry the mail from Brussels to Paris in summer, while in winter, it took eight days to carry a letter from Brussels to Burgos. The relay stations, for the changing of horses and riders, were centres of international news and gossip.

[7]The Italians called the item of news that the merchants and diplomatic agents collected *avviso,* the Germans *zeitung.* All kinds of news were placed in the *avvisi*—political, religious, economic, literary. The Italian depots of archives are rich in collections of *avvisi,* notably the Vatican Library's possession of the *avvisi* sent to the Dukes of Urbino. The *Fugger-Zeitungen* cover the years, 1568 to 1604, filling 27 volumes in the Vienna archives. An example of the style of the Fugger News-Letters is seen, for instance, in the letter on December 27, 1586: "In letters from London it is written that Parliament has condemned the Queen of Scotland to be executed by the sword. But the Queen of England will not suffer it. . . . How this matter will further develop is awaited with anxiety." A few months later there is an exhaustive letter on the sad event. When the *avvisi* were printed the gazette, the modern newspaper, was born. A selection of the Fugger letters have been published in English, *The Fugger News-Letters,* The Bodley Head, London, 1924.

[8]The Venetians fixed three years as the term of office.

[9]Men such as Wolsey and Talleyrand had a very fine income in "pensions" from foreign princes. Treason, you might say; Talleyrand would reply: "Treason is an affair of dates." A more modern practice, which is tempting and disreputable, is to use secret information as a help in Stock Exchange coups. It is said that Holstein, Bismarck's jackal, indulged in such activities, but in his case it was just perversity. All interested in modern diplomacy should read the recent English life of Baron Von Holstein.

of information for the historian; a classic in the field is the Nuncio Bentivolgio's relation on the Flanders of his term of office, a veritable history of the country.

The history of the Papal diplomatic service is of the very greatest interest, because the Pope unlike other sovereigns had spiritual jurisdiction in all the countries, so that his representative had a twofold role. The Papal diplomatic service was established in a permanent fashion under Gregory XIII (1572-1585). Under the *Ancien Regime,* the Papal diplomats were legates, nuncios and inter-nuncios. The legate was a Cardinal who was entrusted with a mission for a particular event. The nuncio was the permanent agent of the Holy See in the various Courts. At first, the Papal diplomacy employed laymen, but the custom developed that the nuncio should be an archbishop, while the internuncio was a lesser diplomatic agent. The agents at the "great" nunciatures—Poland, Venice, France, Empire, South Germany (Munich)—received greater emoluments than the holders of the "little" nunciatures—Savoy, Florence, Gratz, Cologne, Switzerland—and could look forward to the Red Hat. The Papal diplomat conducted his business in much the same fashion as the secular ambassador, although the spiritual affairs of course loomed large in his day's duties.[10] Justly celebrated are the final Relations of these admirable servants of the Holy See in which great wisdom and wide vision are both present.

An English wit (one of the diplomatic tribe) said an ambassador was an honourable man sent to lie abroad for his country's sake. Voltaire said an honest lie was allowed to diplomats, but the great exponents of the art hold that alone sincerity and truth will crown a diplomatic mission with honour and success.

Now I must let the reader into a secret. If he wishes to

---

[10]For instance, the secret Instructions are couched in the same terms as those of secular Powers. The Nuncio, Caraffa, was advised by the Cardinal-Secretary of State in 1607: "I must warn you that the ambassador of England at Brussels, a pupil of Cecil, will do all that is possible to discover your plans. Therefore be on your guard and watch over the members of your household." Again and again the agents are warned to cultivate silence. Talleyrand was perfect in that regard, as beyond a few spiced *bon-mots,* carefully prepared beforehand, he would pass an evening in complete silence. How he was able to find the right moment for the barbed and pregnant remark amounted to genius not given to the ordinary mortal, who is apt to drag in a prepared joke in a most disconcerting fashion.

continue his investigations into this most interesting study of Modern Institutions—diplomacy, newspapers, posts—let him consult Leon Van der Essen's *La Diplomatie,* Brussels, 1953, where he will find other interesting facts on diplomacy and diplomats in the old days. Anyone who heard the placid voice of M. Van der Essen at Louvain blandly unveiling the secrets will rejoice to read this book in which his lectures are expanded and illustrated.

It will be noticed that anything said above is about the diplomatic service before 1789. After the war of 1914-18 there was a demand for open diplomacy, which would have destroyed the intimate nature of the art. We will leave it to the reader to decide if diplomats and diplomacy have changed greatly since the *Ancien Regime.*[11]

T. VEECH.

St Patrick's College, Manly.

---

[11]The diplomatic world with its hierarchy, customs and jargon lend themselves naturally to satire. M. Roger Peyrefitte (whose Australian debut has been so sensational) committed what might be called his original sin in his diplomatic novels, *Les Ambassades* and *La Fin des Ambassades.* His merry wit ascribes stupidity and vice to the members of the diplomatic corps. He rejoices in a dispatch from Berlin in which a French diplomat, a day before the war, informed Paris that M. Hitler was in a state of hesitation, as he had heard "from a sure source." Of course Marcel Proust's Marquis de Norpois quite outshines Peyrefitte's creations.

Book Reviews

MARY'S SPIRITUAL MATERNITY ACCORDING TO MODERN WRITERS, by Rev. Frank J. Kenney, S.M., S.T.L., The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 96, price (paper bound) 1 dollar 25 cents.

This is a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University of America in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology. Rather, it is a synopsis of the original dissertation. Only Chapter II, entitled: "Proofs for the fact of the Spiritual Maternity," is printed in full, the other three chapters, I: "Status quaestionis," III: "Foundations for Mary's Spiritual Maternity," IV: "Consequences of Mary's Spiritual Maternity," being summaries only.

There is evidence that the young author put a great deal of time and energy into his research, though one is tempted to think his subject was much too vast for a theological dissertation of this nature. It is a work of collection of points of view rather than of penetration into the subject.

The chief value of the work is that it brings together in a few pages the many, and often conflicting ideas of modern Mariologists on the basic and complex doctrine of our Lady's spiritual Motherhood of men, and thus serves as an excellent introduction not only to this particular subject but also to the copious writings of our modern authors in the vast field of Mariology.

The chief conclusion one draws from the dissertation is that a great amount of work remains to be done before we can be presented with a truly co-ordinated Mariology. When was Mary *constituted* the Mother of men? In what sense did she "conceive us spiritually when she conceived Christ physically?" In what sense did she "give us birth spiritually on Calvary," when in fact no-one was ipso facto spiritually re-born by her co-operation in the Redemption, or by the Redemption itself? Is the doctrine of the spiritual Maternity possible without the doctrine of Mary's immediate participation in the objective Redemption? There is no clear answer as yet to these and many other fundamental questions, whether from papal documents or theologians. In the field of Mariology the furrows have scarce been turned.

—T.M.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOLOGICAL CENSURES AFTER THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, by John Cahill, O.P., Studia Friburgensia. The University Press. Fribourg, Switzerland, 1955. Pp. 195. Fr. 12.50.

The author of this work investigates the nature of the more important theological censures which are less than heresy. Any such work dealing with deviations from Catholic truth is of great importance to the theologian, for, as the author states in his preface, a study of the different modes of heterodoxy brings out more clearly the nature of orthodox theology according to the mind of the Church.

Father Cahill elucidates the following six censures, which apart from heresy are applied from time to time to dangerous theological doctrines: *error in fide, haeresi proxima, de haeresi suspecta, haeresim sapiens, male sonans and piarum aurium offensiva.* They are terms which are used frequently in manuals of theology, and a thorough understanding of them is necessary for an appreciation of the degree of deviation from truth of the doctrines to which they are applied. It is precisely in clarifying the notions of these censures and their relative importance that the author deserves our gratitude. Also as a result of the study, the distinctions between the various theological notes on the positive side, viz., the dogmatic definition, the strictly theological conclusion, the doctrine which is *proxima fidei* and so on, are thrown into relief.

The Church has never defined the precise meaning of the theological censures. The most authoritative definition of them can be gained only from a critical historical study of their treatment by theologians. The author chose the post-Tridentine period for his study, since before that time theologians had very few such condemnations by the Church to draw on. He examines closely the work of Melchior Cano, *De Locis Theologicis* (1563), who was the first to give an adequate description of each censure. He discusses the contributions of many able theologians from 1563 until the appearance of Antonio de Panormo's *Scrutinium Doctrinarum,* in 1709, amongst whom are Banez, Suarez, de Lugo and the Salmanticenses. His examination of these authors is thorough and critical; he takes from each the conclusions that are most authoritative, so that as a result he gives in conclusion an explanation of each censure which is in accord with the most authoritative sources.

The author is to be commended for his clarity of presentation, his critical examination of the opinions of authors, and his excellent summaries at the end of each chapter. The treatise is of great value to the theologian who must understand clearly the various deviations from truth which appear from

time to time in theological opinions, and who must always have at heart the defence of the truths of our faith against those who attack them.

—P.C.S.

* * * * *

THE STUDENT'S COMPANION TO GIBBON, by William M. Collins, Ph.D., Th.D. Melbourne, The Hawthorn Press. 56pp. 5/-.

This essay from a scholarly pen will remind many of the value of Gibbon's great work, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* which as Dr. Collins remarks is perennial, although published as far back as 1776. Robert Speaight in his recent book on Hilaire Belloc reveals to us the fascination that Gibbon and Macaulay exercised on Belloc. Dr. Collins it is clear has long been a reader of the stately volumes of Gibbon, but he is aware of the dangers in Gibbon's sneers and his faulty historical constructions.

The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire is a child of the so-called Age of Enlightenment—the 18th century. It is a picture of the writer's age and mentality as well as the history of the last period of the Roman Empire, and, the early centuries of the Church's history. Dr. Collins first recalls the facts of Edward Gibbon's conversion to Catholicism, conquered as he said by Bossuet's arguments. He read himself into the Church, as Dr. Collins remarks, who praises the sacrifice Gibbon made. Unhappily it remained an affair of the intellect and much will be forgiven Gibbon when we remember the pressure his family brought to bear upon him. In a short time Gibbon renounced his Catholic faith, and became the English incarnation of the spirit of Voltaire. "It was at Rome, on the 15th of October, 1764, as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the barefooted friars were singing vespers in the Temple of Jupiter, that the idea of uniting the decline and fall of the City first started to my mind." That noble phrase, with certain inaccuracies, as Dr. Collins points out, will always stir the lovers of the past. The superb but melancholy subject had made Gibbon's book one of the best known in the language, which is still being read so that Dr. Collins has prepared his guide for students. In 1793 Gibbon's book was placed on the Index, where surrounded by the filth of the 18th century it remains. Why was this noble book ("Edward Gibbon . . . has always been my cynosure"—thus Toynbee) so treated? Dr. Collins on his last page shows how Gibbon having rejected Christ had to explain the progress and staying power of Christianity from natural causes. Every young theologian has met and refuted Gibbon's reasons for the rapid growth of the Christian Church. Gibbon's venom, of course, is not so much in the reasons themselves, but in the artful way he presents them

by insinuations that remain powerful. Dr. Collins deals with these, pointing out their bias and, sometimes, very inaccurate work, to say the least, of Gibbon; he further examines critically Gibbon's passages on St. George, the Immaculate Conception, the murderous act of St. Cyril of Alexandria, and of course the "fewness" of the martyrs. He indicates the main sources of Gibbon (although Tillemont is not given much prominence, as Gibbon obtained most reliable information from the patient, unreadable work of the Jansenist), and the opinions of some of his early opponents.

It was nothing for the erudite Prince von Bulow to read right through a vast work such as Gibbon's during a winter. Winter is upon us; Dr. Collins's learned guide is there to point out the dangers; the stately volumes of Gibbon are facing us. *Tout le monde a la bataille.*

T.V.

* * * * *

THE DYNAMICS of WORLD HISTORY, by Christopher Dawson. Edited by John J. Mulloy. Sheed and Ward, London. 1957. XI + 472 pp. 25/-.

The editor of this substantial volume has brought together the essays which Mr. Dawson has written over the years, with the intention of giving readers in a convenient form a *corpus* of Mr. Dawson's views on world history.

By very great learning, Mr. Dawson since he published *The Age of the Gods* in 1928 has won a very high place among historians, although he has always asserted his Catholic outlook in a way which one would rarely see in Catholic historians on the Continent. This book is divided into two parts. The first part, Toward a Sociology of History, in which Mr. Dawson advocates the study of the fundamental social unity, a culture. What is a culture? "A culture," Mr. Dawson writes, "is a common way of life—a particular adjustment of man to his natural surroundings and his economic needs." There are three main influences which modify a culture, race, milieu and the economic factor. To these three Mr. Dawson adds a fourth, the psychological. He feels that the never-ending research by historians on the smallest points of life in the past is without purpose unless the meaning of the story of the past can be grasped, in particular the role of religion. Denied in the 18th century, ignored in the following century, many historians now feel the need to defend spiritual values. Just recently two well-known men of letters took up that cause, T. S. Eliot and Andre Maurois, as they see the terrible danger to culture as Europeans have known it. Anatole France in his old age, conscious that the young generation was resentful of the bland scepticism and hedonism of his earlier days, attempted to

find in Marxism a gospel that he could preach. At least this procedure failed in the case of Anatole France.

Mr. Dawson reviews some of the leading men who have tried to explain the meaning of history, from the first St. Augustine in his *City of God,* then Edward Gibbon and the Fall of Rome, Karl Marx and the Dialectic of History, H. G. Wells and the Outline of History, Oswald Spengler and the Life of Civilizations, and the last Arnold Toynbee. These appreciations will interest many readers, as Dawson treats them wisely, with wit, and vast learning. He is severe on Spengler and Toynbee; with Gibbon, in spite of all, he is sympathetic—*Perfidus ille Deo quamvis non perfidus Urbi;* his essay on Marx is brilliant; while he treats kindly of poor old Wells, "a frustrated evangelist who was always on the verge of producing an apocalypse or founding a new religion. . . ." Left on the bank of the river of success, so Mr. Somerset Maugham summed up the failure of Wells. And there are even signs that Mr. Maugham is finding himself high and dry in his Riviera retreat. Tales of polite adultery hardly help in preserving spiritual values. *Dynamics of World History* requires an effort to read, but it is a book that will reward the effort.

T.V.